DIVINITY SCHOOL
LIBRARY

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

April, 1943

THAT DAMN PREACHER — *Alexander Mackie* — 89

THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE NEAR ORIENT — *James A. Montgomery* — 98

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CHIASMUS FOR INTERPRETATION — *N. W. Lund* — 105

ARE BAPTISTS GOING TO ROME? — *Robert A. Ashworth* — 124

FOUR FUNDAMENTALISMS — *Alban G. Widgery* — 129

ONCE MORE, THE POOR AUTHOR — *Milton F. Wells* — 136

JOHN AMOS COMENIUS — *Andrew Paul Slabey* — 140

WHERE IGNORANCE IS BLISS, 'TIS FOLLY — 149

FROM OFF THE CAMPUS AND ON — 152

BOOK REVIEWS — 154

BOOK NOTICES — 170

BOOKS RECEIVED — 175

Volume XX — Number 2

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

Published by
Crozer Theological Seminary
Chester, Pennsylvania

MORTON S. ENSLIN, Editor
RITTENHOUSE NEISSER, Business Manager

The policy of the CROZER QUARTERLY is to present investigations, discussions, and reviews in the field of religion which will prove of value and interest to the professional student of religion and to the layman.

Manuscripts, books for review, and communications for the editor should be addressed
Editor of the CROZER QUARTERLY
Chester, Pennsylvania
Business communications and subscriptions should be addressed
Business Manager of the CROZER QUARTERLY
Chester, Pennsylvania

Issued Quarterly $1.50 a year Single Numbers, 40 cents

Entered as second-class matter, December 21, 1923, at the post office at Chester, Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized December 21, 1923.

Copyright, 1943, by Crozer Theological Seminary. All rights reserved.

THE JUDSON PRESS PRINTED IN U.S.A

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

Vol. XX APRIL, 1943 No. 2

THAT DAMN PREACHER

ALEXANDER MACKIE

President, Presbyterian Ministers' Fund

"WHAT you gonna do about that damn preacher?" said Lou Emmons, vice-president of the Delaware County Chamber of Commerce, to Josh Taylor, president of that distinguished body, one night in the Chester Club about twelve years ago.

We had been holding a meeting of the board of directors and I had probably made some remark to the effect that I did not think the primary purpose of a Chamber of Commerce was to minister earnestly and untiringly to the hopes and plans of the beneficent public service corporations of the county or even to name a new street after an ancestor of one of the directors.

I don't suppose Emily Post would like it that I happened to overhear the post-directors' meeting conversation of our president and vice-president, but I can assure her that I did not intend to listen in on any private and personal discussion. Like all eavesdroppers, I heard nothing particularly good of myself—and Mrs. Post can rest confidently in the knowledge that I do not and will not, to any degree, or in any manner, permit myself ever to question her *dicta probantia.*

I ought to have known better. I had been a minister of the gospel for approximately twenty years. If by that time a Protestant clergyman does not know that, like a child, there are many, many times when he is to be seen and not heard, there is something wrong—radically wrong—with his cultural background. Anyhow, I ought to have known it. Dr. Francis Landley Paton, *Doctor Angelicus* as some have called him, had told me the same thing years before when I was a student, or shall I say "in residence," at Princeton Theological Seminary.

"You get free light, free heat, free room rent, and a scholarship," said he to Dave Evans and me as we sat one spring afternoon in his parlor; "that ought to stop your mouths!" And all this, so graciously and winsomely said on the occasion of our first and only visit to his home, because Dave and I had affixed, as representing our respective classes, our brave and youthful signatures to a memorial to the board of directors of the Seminary, in which memorial we had respectfully stated that certain courses in the Seminary could stand a certain amount of improvement. *Inter alia* we had stated that "The course in theism as at present consti-

tuted is both uninteresting and unintelligible." Now President Patton taught the class in theism.

Dave and I had thought we were doing the Seminary a favor in extending to that venerable institution our patronage—at least, I had so thought. I had been praised by the ladies of our church at home because I had decided to be a minister, and my way through college had been lightened a bit for the same reason. Now I was, thanks to the Seminary's munificence, as Dr. Patton pointed out so sweetly, on easy street. And in addition, on the occasions on which I had preached on "And Peter followed afar off," or "Will ye also go away?" (my two faithful traveling companions as I went in seminary days from place to place, like Saul of old "breathing out threatenings and slaughter") there had always been some dear lady, usually a little hard of hearing, to say to me, at the close of the service, "What a lovely sermon!"

Little did I dream that ere long the eager voices of praise would be hushed in silence and a bumptious elder whose cultural history did not extend beyond the record of the making of a casual acquaintance—very casual—with the famous three R's, would say at the close of the service to an equally trained thinker, "What was the old man talking about this morning? He must have made that sermon up walking over from the manse to the church." Little did I dream that the gems of thought, so lavishly distributed in student days and/or in the morning flush of my popularity as the "new minister" in Sharon Hill, would be transmuted by some subtle alchemy, related closely to what might be called the *vox populi* complex, into pearls cast with even greater care and, I trust, a growing erudition, before some of my "waiting congregation."

Protestantism, once a determining factor in the solving of every issue of any major importance in American life, has degenerated into a futile gesture. We have been excluded, and rightly, because we speak with an uncertain and sometimes crackpot voice from the U. S. O. And America—Protestant America—is now represented by an ambassador—no matter by what name we call him—at the Vatican! And this in spite of the feeble protests of Baptist, Presbyterians, Methodists, *et al.* in solemn convention assembled! Washington knew it did not need to worry about our protests. American Protestants confine their protests to carefully worded resolutions. How many votes do we control to back up our resolutions? Besides, Washington knew we would soon be absorbed again in an acrimonious and solemn controversy about some theological argument that Jesus had settled centuries ago, when he said, "Follow me!" And once more we would fight our battles over and with our men of straw! And we would forget all about our ambassador without portfolio and without authority at the Vatican!

Protestantism has become a feeble gesture and a futile gesture in American life, because Protestantism has lost its corporate courage. And Protestantism has lost its corporate courage because it has devoted itself to the squeezing out and the nullifying of courage wherever courage is found in the Protestant ministry.

What kills the courage of the Protestant minister? Why is the brave boy of twenty-five, the young David who refuses the armor of a king, the acquiescent, hand-rubbing, sometimes oleaginous pastor of forty-five?

Just as there are four freedoms, so there are four pressures. To these four pressures every Protestant minister is subject—and by the time they are through with him all the courage and initiative which he has ever had have been squeezed out of him. This can usually be accomplished by the time he is forty-five; certainly, by the time he has passed his fiftieth birthday.

The first is what we might call the theoretical pressure, by which phrase, we mean the pressure of theories. This type of pressure can manifest itself in a variety of ways. Its effectiveness is obvious in the type of Protestant services and sermons in greatest vogue over the radio. Any intelligent Protestant ought to blush at the vast majority of sermons (to which, thank God, there are notable and magnificent exceptions) broadcast from day to day, but particularly on the Sabbath. Are we to understand that the only way to the Christian life is to be first of all a drunkard, a thief, and a wife-beater? And that Protestantism is the way of thought and life attainable only for those who have enjoyed the pleasures of sin for a protracted season—protracted usually until their circulatory, digestive, or other biological functions are so worn out that they fail to tune in, very satisfactorily any longer, with station S.I.N.? Or is Protestantism a way of thought in which the sublime truths of eternity are to be reduced to the common denominator of the sob content of *A Thousand Sacred Thoughts* or the intellectual stimulation of pious stories of doubtful authenticity? Or is the whole of Protestantism comprehended in one great doctrine, like, for example, the theory of a substitutionary atonement or the imminent and visible premillennial return of our Lord? Or is Protestantism a big convention of red-hot organizers, key men, men with iron in their blood, men with everything in their heads except horse sense? A great round table, about which are gathered typewriters and adding machines, and card indices and a pile of statistics about how many houses, in, for example, Chester, have a hydrant in the front yard and a toilet in the back? Or is Protestantism a tiresome academic discussion of what Plato or Socrates or (for that matter) Xanthippe thought about immortality or heredity or environment, or, bless your heart, evolution? An

arena in which are eternally to be fought out the old, old battles between men of straw—dead as leaves in December long, long ago?

And then there's the new theology for our intelligentsia and our heretical professors! The theology of crisis! The neo-realism! The neo-humanism! A lot of talk with a lot of words which when stripped of all their trimmings leave us just where we were before! What's the difference, let me humbly ask, between an *ashram*[1] and an old-fashioned, all-night prayer meeting? None—except the ventilation is better and the ground, for continuous kneeling purposes, is not so hard as the floor.

"And so long as a man rides his hobby-horse peacably and quietly along the king's highway," my dear Uncle Toby is recorded as saying in that great compendium of knowledge, *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gent.*, "and neither compels you nor me to get up behind him, pray, sir, what have either you or I to do with it?" "Nothing," we answer, "but that doesn't happen in church." Any kind of preacher is expected to ride a hobbyhorse—and to be very good at it.

The first pressure, then, to which the young Protestant minister is subjected is the pressure of the hobbyhorse. Let the young Protestant minister know that his task is not to think through to right and to think through to truth. His task is to think through to a hobbyhorse and to ride that horse for all it and he are worth. Let him know that it is not courage and not clarity of intellect which are required for hobbyhorse riding, but opportunism, a loud voice, a flair for the dramatic, and, if possible, a glad hand.

The second pressure is the theological pressure. This may be the pressure of heterodoxy or the pressure of orthodoxy. And both heterodoxy and orthodoxy are terms of wide connotation. But in either case, a minister must be properly labeled. And like the animals whom Adam named, by whatsoever name the young preacher is called as he steps out from the classic halls of his seminary into the wide, wide world, by that name he is forever known. In other words, somewhere between the age of twenty and thirty, a young man who has lived the cloistered life of a student or who is possibly an experienced businessman, having worked somewhere or other for a couple of years as a clerk or a book agent before hearing the call to the ministry—a young man in his twenties is to be labeled heterodox or orthodox. Let him dare to think other than in the terminology of that label—and he is through. Heterodoxy and orthodoxy both have their value—and both can bring their ministerial rewards. But geographical, social, and economic factors enter into the question of how, when, and where, to pursue either heterodoxy or orthodoxy. On the

[1] For the meaning of this Indian term and its significance (if any) for American life, see J. M. Bader's article, "The Christian Ashram Fellowship," in *Religion and Life*, XI, (Summer, 1942), pp. 364–372.—The Editor.

whole, I would say that in greater New York City and in New York State as well as in New England, one might advantageously wear the label of a liberal. It is uncomfortable, dreadfully uncomfortable, to be classified as a liberal in what our dear friends have called "The Bible Belt" or even in Philadelphia. This choice between theological labels, the young minister is forced to make as he stands on the threshold of his career.

Years ago, Robert Dick Wilson, who had been my professor at Princeton—a brave man who in his old age cast aside his distinguished position in the faculty of Princeton Seminary, a comfortable salary, and a pension, in order that he might follow his convictions—a man to whom I owe more personally than to any other theologian or theological professor, called me out of the sessions of the General Assembly. He had recommended me for the chair of theology in one of our seminaries. "Mackie," said he, "what is your theological position?" And we talked together. Finally he said, "You're a Ritschlian." I didn't know just what a Ritschlian was. It had been my proud boast that "I was ignorant, but I was orthodox." But I decided afterwards that "Ritschlian" must have been something bad, as I didn't get the job.

But there I was, not quite thirty-five years of age. I was trying to think my way through—reading, studying, praying, preaching, and trying humbly to imitate Jesus. I was a "Ritschlian." Maybe I was—and maybe I wasn't. But at thirty-five, I was supposed to have reached final and absolute conviction as to the nature of the Godhead, the riddle of conduct and character, and the outreach of the infinite mercy.

God help modern art! God help modern business! God help national and international relationships, and God help modern science if by the time men are thirty-five years of age they are forbidden to think any further!

The third pressure that squeezes the courage out of the young Protestant preacher is ecclesiastical pressure. This is a sort of, shall we say, society pressure exercised by the theological four hundred. Mrs. Astor's horse could well tremble in the presence of the gentlemen who sit at desks in our denominational headquarters or who grace with solemn regularity the platforms of our church courts. There are things which in ecclesiastical circles are simply not done. It is dreadfully improper, for example, to call a spade a spade. While you usually have full liberty to hurl the most picturesque biblical epithets against Demon Rum and any dens of iniquity far enough removed from your own parish not to affect your own congregational life, it is dreadfully improper to suggest in a church assembly that the management of any agency or interest of the church is incompetent or that a pious fraud (particularly in human form) is a liar.

To handle such problems there is an approved *modus operandi.* First, you must use the language of Zion. This is a peculiar dialect known well

to the initiate, but rather high-sounding and impressive for those who are not "in the know." All must be done decently and in order. Matters must be carefully and prayerfully considered. To this end, the subject should be laid on the table, or better still, a committee appointed. Who got up this idea about committees anyhow? Jesus never appointed a committee. When he had something to say about the scribes and the Pharisees, he said it. And when there was a man to be healed, he healed him. And when there was a cross to be borne, he bore it. There would never have been a Calvary and there would never have been a Reformation if the world had waited for the then current church fathers to have appointed a committee.

This ecclesiastical pressure began poignantly in my own experience one day in presbytery about twenty-five years ago when the chairman of our Committee on Morals, Temperance, Etc., Etc., brought in a stinging report directed against the good ladies who were handing out cigarettes to the soldiers on their way to France. In my youthful arrogance, I arose and said I was surprised and deeply grieved at hearing of this shocking state of affairs; I understood that not only were the soldiers smoking but I had heard that some of our ministers and some of our elders were guilty of this habit. Well, bedlam broke loose! The statement about the elders was a little too much. Up jumped one of them, shouting in stentorian voice, "We'll have no buffoonery in presbytery! No buffoonery!"

I should have known better. There was a perfectly proper way of handling the situation. I should have waited for the vote to be taken. I could then have kept quiet when the moderator put the question, "All in favor will please say 'Aye.' " And if he called for the negative vote, I could have said "No" very quietly or have been busy handing a hymnbook to someone near me. The vote would have been passed not unanimously but *nemine contradicente!* Bless your heart, I didn't know what *nemine contradicente* was. I always thought "Yes" meant "Yes" and "No" meant "No." As a matter of fact, had I been of sufficient importance ecclesiastically, I might have left before the vote was taken after arising and saying, "Mr. Moderator, I am deeply interested in this important subject and regret sincerely that I must leave before the vote is taken as I must attend the meeting of our Ladies' Aid Society." But anybody who knew me would have known that I didn't have anything of very great importance on hand. And besides, I never went to the Ladies' Aid Society. I always thought that the women of the church were its most competent department —and they at least didn't need the oversight of the dear pastor.

The fourth pressure is the economic pressure—want of bread. At forty-five or fifty most ministers have boys and girls in college. At forty-five or fifty most preachers are too old, or think they are too old, or are thought to be too old, to take up another profession. At forty-five or fifty

many ministers have loans against their life insurance policies, made to give their children a chance to go to college. At forty-five or fifty a Baptist preacher or a Presbyterian preacher or any other preacher serving under a nonepiscopal polity is usually through—that is, if he wants another job. Just what kind of preacher can be courageous—really courageous—after forty-five?

It is true that ministers' salaries are meager—a condition which arises out of several causes. One is that congregations are inclined to be stingy and inclined to bargain. It is a rare minister who will bargain. He takes what he gets because he believes the Lord has called him to do a work. It is a rare minister who is stingy. The altruistic impulse which leads a man into the service of the church is not a compelling force with men who are stingy. On the whole and by and large the laity tend to capitalize the minister's altruism.

It is true also, of course, that some ministers are emphatically overpaid. Third-rate men who are both lazy and inclined to strut have, not only in the ministry but in other walks of life, a sense of the value of their services which is, on the whole, disproportionate to their abilities or their willingness to do hard work. And some, by earnest and persistent effort, manage to draw larger salaries than they earn. As long, therefore, as we have human beings in the clergy we must expect this problem.

The real basis of economic pressure is found in the fact that we have far, far too many churches and far, far too many ministers. Our people tend to give generously. But we do not spend their money wisely. Where there is chronically a group of unemployed Protestant ministers even in wartime, there is something wrong with the way in which we admit men into the ministry—and by admitting them, set them up as a permanent liability against the assets of the church.

We must stop recruiting for the ministry. Do we recruit for the law, or for teaching, or for medicine? Must we hold summer conferences for impressionable young people and play upon their idealism and emotions in order to give our courts, our hospitals, and our colleges a full quota of raw material? The most effective way for a minister to attract young men into the ministry is to be himself a good—and a brave!—minister of Jesus Christ.

We have far too many churches. The money we waste in duplication of overhead would more than adequately support the ministry, and most of our churches are weak, pathetic affairs. I passed by a Catholic church one Friday night last summer—a Friday night at the seashore. The marble altar was all glorious with light. The church was crowded with worshipers. The solemn music of the organ rolled across the little street. Near by

there were a Presbyterian church, a Baptist church, a Methodist church, and two Episcopal churches. But every Protestant door was closed.

We do not need Baptists; we do not need Presbyterians; we do not, save the mark, need even Episcopalians. We need Christians! And we need captains courageous for our Christians—men who will dare to say "Yes" and to live "Yes," who will dare to say "No" and to live "No." But simply to point out this need is not to solve the problem. In fact we do not expect totally to eliminate our difficulties, for some of our difficulties are inherent in human nature. But we can do a great deal towards remedying conditions.

I have pointed out at least by implication the first remedy. We need fewer and better churches. How pathetic is our Protestantism as it stands over against the Roman Catholic Church! Why could not one Protestant church serve most of our American towns? Eleven o'clock, or ten-thirty o'clock in the morning is not the only hour at which men could worship God. There could be a multitude of services held at different hours. These services could be of different types: highly liturgical for those who find the best approach to God through the dignity of worship; simple gospel services for those whose hearts grow strangely warm under the spell of evangelistic preaching and singing; services with sermon; and services only with prayer and praise. There could be more than one minister—and at that, we wouldn't need as many ministers as now we have.

The second remedy is better ministers. Nothing has delighted me in many years as greatly as Dr. Reid's article in the July issue of the Crozer Quarterly. All he says about us is true. But there are some things that he did not say that I want to say, and I think I can say them with a better factual knowledge than any other minister in the United States. I stand at the ministerial crossroads of the world. Into our Fund, in person and through the mail, pour, in confidence, the hopes and fears of the Protestant clergy. For honor, for love of the right, for self-sacrifice, for self-forgetfulness, for faithfulness to duty, the minister stands first—*facile princeps.* I know something about banks and bankers; I know something about real estate and realtors; I know something about investments and investors; I know something about even professors. I know much about business with its *"caveat emptor"* and the cold shrug of the shoulders at the tragedy of some fellow businessman and its hypocritical, "Well, it's just too bad!" And I know that the noblest, the best, and the most valuable citizen of the United States is the Protestant minister. And I know of course that he can stand some improvement. But if I wanted men who would follow me into some forlorn hope or try to make some dream come true, I would recruit most of my followers among the ministry—and that, without money and without price.

The third remedy is more and better laymen. The trouble with the average layman is that he is totally superficial about his religion. If he has a zeal, it is usually a zeal not according to knowledge. His theology is something about which he has not thought since he left the primary department in the Sunday school. His church program is sometimes colored by the sharp practices of business, and his concept of the kingdom of God is no broader than his mental picture of "the little brown church in the vale." He is usually too busy making money to know how to use it. It is he who insists that the minister must be young, must have no opinions except those satisfactory to his paying constituency. It is he who promptly answers by eliminating him from any place where he may exercise power or influence, that minister about whom he has first asked the question, "What you gonna do about that damn preacher?"

THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE NEAR ORIENT TO THE CONCEPT OF UNIVERSAL HISTORY

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY

University of Pennsylvania

Bounded on the north by the Anatolian mountain ranges, on the east by the highlands of Media and Persia, on the south by the Indian Ocean, on the west by the left bank of the Nile and the Mediterranean, with outlet to the Atlantic Ocean—such are the confines of the ancient Near Orient. Its valleys of the Nile and the Euphrates-Tigris are patent to the historian's eye as homes of civilization, its deserts were equally swarming and roaming grounds for the propagation and contacts of its peoples. It is not an accident of history that we go to an early document of that world for the earliest ethnological pedigree with its geographical survey, namely, to the Table of Nations in Genesis 10. Its axis, east to west, extends from Media to Spanish Tarshish,[1] and that of north to south from the peoples of Anatolia to the Yemen, facing the Indian Ocean. With the exception of Egypt, extending in the narrow Nile valley for some thousand miles, there are few natural borders in that widespread field, which possesses its avenues of transit, by the Euphrates and Tigris, the Northern Crescent, and the valleys and plains of Syria-Palestine. The history of that extensive territory was not immobile, static; apart from the amazing fresh discoveries of anthropologists,[2] we have learned of the extensive movements of the Semitic peoples, whose groups and origins can be only vaguely determined, like the Habiru,[3] the biblical Hebrews, the Aramæans, the later so-called Arabs, as of Nabatæa and Palmyra. The history of Abraham is at least parabolically true for the shifting scenes in the first half of the second millennium B.C., the migrant without settled home, ranging from the Euphrates to the Nile, "the Hebrew" himself, but given family ties which connect him with the peoples of the length of the north-south axis of the Semitic world.

But the borders of that area were not secure, and there occurred the mass immigrations of Elamites and Cassites, of Hurrians (the biblical Horites),[4] and Hyksos and Hittites. But war in those days was not the

[1] For an early Phœnician inscription from Sardinia referring to Tarshish see the most recent study by W. F. Albright in *Bull. Am. Schools of Or. Research,* LXXXIII (1941), pp. 14 ff.

[2] See for recent surveys E. A. Speiser, *Mesopotamian Origins* (1930), and Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (1940).

[3] For the most recent discussions and identifications see E. G. Kraeling and W. F. Albright, *Bull. Am. Schools of Or. Research,* LXXVII (1940), pp. 32 f.; H. H. Rowley, *Pal. Expl. Quarterly* (1940), pp. 90 ff.

[4] See Speiser, *Ethnic Movements in the Near East in the Second Millennium B.C.,* in *Annual* of the Am. Schools of Or. Research, XIII (1933), pp. 13 ff., and his *Hurrian Grammar, ibid.,* XX (1941).

sole means of intercourse and exchange; indeed, as usual in history, attempted conquest followed the channels of established commerce. The copper of Oman and the stone of the mountains north and east were early transported to the alluvial lands of the Sumerians. Thothmes III reports the fetching of cedar trunks sixty ells long overland from the Lebanon. This commerce was much enlarged by Solomon's day; the Lebanon cedar for his temple was rafted by sea from Phœnicia to a Palestinian port (I Kings 5), and later there are the deservedly triumphant reports of such transportation to the distant palaces of Esarhaddon and Nebuchadnezzar. The spices of Arabia Felix crossed the deserts and passed over the seas from early days. There is ample record of such Egyptian commerce from the Vth Dynasty, the age of the Pyramid builders,[5] and later Queen Hatshepsut records her commercial ventures on the Red Sea to Punt, the land of frankincense.[6] There is the dictum of the classical geographer Sprenger[7] that "the Arabs, the people of the frankincense region, were the founders of international commerce, as it existed in antiquity." We have authentic records of the Hebrew commerce in Solomon's day, about 1000 B.C. He was in trading contact with Hiram of Tyre, whose seat was "in the heart of the (western) sea," to use Ezekiel's word (28:1 ff.), and with Hiram's aid he built a fleet for the navigation of the *Ultimum Mare,* on which the Red Sea opens, and received a visit of courtesy from the Arabian queen of Sheba.[8] One of Hiram's navigators may have looked out upon the Atlantic Ocean to the west, and again over some broad expanse of the Indian Ocean, facing the Far Orient. The static stability of that region for now many centuries, with its one rather monotonous religion, with one speech for most of it, belies to the modern observer its ancient variety and enterprise. The Suez Canal has reopened to us moderns the vista of the centrality of the Near East in antiquity.

In the middle of the third millennium Naram-Sin of Agade in Babylonia entitled himself "King of the Four Quarters," *i.e.,* of the world.[9] This is the earliest statement on record of œcumenical imperialism, not more boastful than many subsequent like self-assertions. And we pursue in that great valley the inevitable imperialization of the many small city-states, themselves of diverse origin, Sumerian and Semitic, the centre shifting under successive dynasties, and the idea successfully borrowed by outside neighbors, like the Elamites and Cassites. The most significant figure in that imperial succession is Hammurabi, who published the first

[5] Middle of the third millennium; see Breasted, *History of Egypt* (1895), pp. 127 f.

[6] Breasted, *op. cit.,* pp. 277 ff.

[7] *Die alte Geographie Arabiens* (1875), p. 279.

[8] I Kings 9 f. For queens of Arabia and the verisimilitude of the story of that royal visit see the writer's *Arabia and the Bible,* pp. 58, 180 f.

[9] G. A. Barton, *The Royal Inscriptions of Sumer and Akkad* (1929), p. 139.

great code of imperial law, the predecessor of many notable successors, such as Justinian and Napoleon. Dynasties came and went; there arose a military power in the north, that of Assyria, which after centuries of endeavor established firm dominion over the North Semitic area.

That Mesopotamian centralization of empire had its earlier parallel in the narrow valley of the Nile, in which the Egyptian kingdom was fairly secure; but in the New Empire it expanded into Asia to meet the challenge of empires there. A third such imperial land loomed in Anatolia, that of the Hittites, and for the first time in Western history there emerged the conflicts of empires, of Egypt and the Hittites, of Assyria and the remains of the latter empire, of Assyria's revived successor Babylonia and Egypt on the Asiatic-African frontiers. The ideology of empire has been established; tribes, cantons, kingdoms were to be brought into one whole.

And in the evolution of history this aspiration after world empire passed on to Persia, a stranger hitherto in the elder Oriental complex. There ensued the inevitable conflict of the new empire with the Ionians on the West Anatolian coast—not settled by the Greek naval victory at Salamis. To counter that power it was necessary to establish a stronger *imperium,* and this Alexander achieved. He overthrew Persia, carried his arms into India, and made the first great military cruise of Westerners in the Indian Ocean. He died in Babylon—the city of the confusion of tongues, according to Gen. 10—which city he purposed to make the capital of his new empire.[10] He died hailed as a god—a note distinctive of the following imperialisms. The Seleucids and the Ptolemies endeavored to carry on that tradition, but unsuccessfully with their rivalries (cf. Dan. 11); they were effective only in destroying the old folk-states. Then Rome emerged from the little city on the Seven Hills, with an almost unconscious advance, that is paralleled only by the history of the British empire. It met one by one its several rivals, Northern Gauls, Semitic Phœnicians, Hellenistic states. The ancient local democracy was unable to control the empire, which became perforce military on such a stage, and Augustus arbitrarily established an imperial constitution. Where of old the Hebrew despised the uncircumcised Philistine, and the Greek the barbarian, and the Roman the subject peoples, all were brought, willy-nilly, into an imperial complex, in which the peoples were to live as one, and where political policy would require complete fusion with loss of identities.

In the spiritual quarter there were two possible consequences of such totalitarianism. In one direction, that of least resistance, lay the pooling of all issues in one conglomeration of politics and ethos and religion. In the last-named field many a case of syncretism arose by amalgamation of

[10] "Babel" should be pronounced "Babble," so as to express the Hebrew wordplay of *bbl* and *bll* ("confusion").

local religions and cults; the land of Syria was typical of this phenomenon. In the empires the gods had increased, and presumably all were to be a happy family. And yet religion, the deepest root of culture in that old world—whether Semitic, or Egyptian, or Aryan—required its apogee of centralization, and it came about by necessary logic that Alexander and his Successors, following ancient Oriental clues, especially Egyptian, proclaimed themselves "Manifest Gods." This religio-political theory was logically adopted by the legally minded Roman empire. The Augusti became *Divi,* and loyalty to the state was attested by affirmation of the state religion in this apex, as the Christian church discovered through its martyrs and by its ultimate triumph. Hellenistic Greece and Rome undertook to insure their permanence by effecting a spiritual unity, through a religious totalitarianism that came from the Orient.

Or, on the other hand, there was the consequence of blunt, noncompromising reaction. This was exhibited permanently by only one small ethnical group, the Bnē Israel. Long before the shadow of imperialism had settled upon the world, this people had taken its stand nationally. Despite all arguments of Ahab's international diplomacy, Elijah dared him to the face with the dilemma uttered for the first time in history: "If the Baal be the God, worship him, but if Yahweh, then worship him!" This might appear as expression of mere tribal exclusiveness. But in the next century Amos drew the full consequences. Israel's God is God of the whole world, and the fortunes of the peoples are all in his hands: "Are ye not as the Cushites unto me, ye Israelites?, saith Yahweh. Have I not brought up Israel from the land of Egypt, and the Philistines from Caphtor, and Aram from Kir?" Israel's advance from a tribalistic religion through monolatry to monotheism did not proceed by political triumph, but in the experience of political disaster. Amos uttered his statement of his God's world-wide empire when he foresaw Israel's doom under the heel of Assyria. Students of the Hebrew religion are today eagerly pursuing its affiliations with the cults and theologies of Canaanites and other Semites, and are in this respect like the zoologists, who insist properly on man's descent from the lower mammalians, but cannot tell as yet just when and where—and more particularly how—*homo sapiens* with all his differentia originated.

The northern kingdom of Israel fell, as Amos predicted. But the religion of the fathers survived in Judah. This small people, with the faithful probably only a minority, outlived the purgatory of the destruction of their own state. Israel became a church, with a similar in the Persian Mazdæan religion, but with an effect upon the world's history such as the latter had not. As church Israel endured, resolving itself into political status, whenever opportunity offered, as in the Maccabæan revolt; yet this

outbreak was primarily religious, since it lay in the denial of worship to the totalitarian Antiochus Epiphanes, "Manifest God," as his title means. With the failure of its political enterprises, attempted by the Hasmonæans, the Herods, the Zealots, it survived as a religion, a church. And this religious folk pursued a logic which small sects often fight shy of, in pride or to avoid public notice. The same age of Exile and Post-Exile produced seers like the Second Isaiah, who preached a missionary programme—a divine event was expected, in which lowly Israel was to be the actor, as in a late Psalm, "to be the light of the gentiles, and to be the glory of thy people Israel." And all this was not mere pious, supernal theory. Israel became a propaganda society, open to all who would confess the one God and obey his law as revealed to Israel—again not as theory but as praxis and ritual in both religion and ethics. In this it was followed by its child, the Christian church, which propagated itself first in the missionary stations of Jewry, the synagogues and the schools for proselytes, and with the identical inherited motive that "the knowledge of Yahweh should cover the earth as the waters cover the sea." The Christian following the Semitic, Oriental Jew, held that the unity of man and his history is bound up with the oneness of God. This contribution with all its social and political consequences "the Israel of God" gave to the world. For that communion of saints the purpose of history and the faith for man and his future were based on the faith in the one God.

The rise and triumphal development of Islam are a subject below my historical limits. Islam had its progenitors in Judaism and Christianity, and like the former appeared first as a folk religion, "for the Arabs," as its prophet primarily meant. But its doctrine of the one God, therefore of one humanity, drove it by immediate, rigorous logic into the status of a world religion, like contemporary Christendom. The historical import of this development appears when we recognize that, in addition to the global expansion of Christianity, Islam is the dominant religion of all southwestern Asia, northern Africa, along with a powerful intrusion into India and farther on, as far as the Philippine Islands. These two religions, along with still surviving original Judaism, all derive from a limited quarter of the Near Orient. And as political constitutions the Holy Royal Empire and the Muslim Caliphate have been major factors in Western history. The unity of God idealistically demanded the corporate unity of mankind, a kingdom of God upon earth.

The Judæo-Christian development of a monotheism and of the theory of a divinely purposed history of mankind is the eldest of the Oriental contributions in higher religion to our West, as it remains the only permanent one in faith and form. But, as it was the intensity of the Hebrew religious conviction that gave that religion its start and its success as a world move-

ment, so we find compeers from that same zealous, often fanatical, world following in similar lines, and making their propaganda in parallel ways. Local, national religions, that had lost their political prestige, were transformed into religions open to all men. The influence of that religious Orient appears in Pythagoreanism; later there were the cults of Cybele and Isis, Persian Mithraism, centres of religious devotion and pilgrimage like that of the Syrian Goddess, not to speak of all kinds of magical groups. These intruded into the West with the breakdown of the religions of the provincial city-states, like Athens and Rome, and of an innumerable small fry. They propagated themselves among all men, encouraging inquirers, fascinating them with initiations, secrets, mysteries, by "conversion"—to use Professor A. D. Nock's most pertinent term, which serves as title of a book of his (1933). Absurd as they appear to us, they had their part in reviving the spirits of men, when ancient tribe and city and nation were lost in imperial complexes, which made the individual as nothing. They gave, even if through charlatanry, a "vision of the whole," and the hope to read the riddle of the universe. It was in this nervous, expectant religious *milieu* that Israel had its notable early propaganda of proselytes, a mission continued with definite success by the Christian church.

There is another direction in which the Orient at large led the world of which it became a part, namely, eschatology. This subject divides into two parts: the future fate of the individual, and the ultimate outcome of human history. It is with the latter outlook that the present thesis is concerned. None of the ancient nature religions denied the human spirit's continuance after death. But the moralization of religion, the compelling hypothesis of the divine righteousness, raised the questions, *cui bono?* and *ad quem terminum?* There was entailed for any religion which had risen above mere rites—prophetic religions we may call such developments—the problem of the conflict of good and evil within human society and throughout the universe. Here Persian religion advanced to the extreme with its pronounced dualism, which doctrine had its bearing upon Judaism and Christianity, although Jewish thought had long possessed its own independent apocalyptic, as in the Second Isaiah and Daniel, because of its dissatisfaction with the world as it is.[11] There entered the doctrine of the succession of ages—an early attempt at a philosophy of history—to have their consummation in the triumph of the good, that is, in biblical language, in the kingdom of God, earthly or heavenly, for apocalyptic is never definite. Through these developments of Oriental religion human thought was lifted up from the merely provincial and transitory and finally meaningless to a philosophy of the whole cosmos, of "the ages of ages," and

[11] For the later Jewish apocalyptic and its alleged dependence upon Zoroastrianism see the writer's *Commentary on Daniel* (1927), Intro. §20.

"the world of worlds." And that ancient eschatology has remained an abiding strain in our world's thought ever since, not only in the religious circles where it was born, but also in the politics of our day. We are still being taught apocalyptically by secular thinkers that the golden age is just around the corner. *Historia docet et doceat.* Such hopes have been again dashed twice within the current generation. History teaches, but is not a science, in the sense that it foretells.

Science, as a contribution to the idea of cosmic unity and the possible fellowship of all human minds in fixed lines of philosophy, may be only briefly referred to. Mathematics and astronomy started in the ancient Mesopotamian lands, giving secular proof of the unity of the physical world.[12] It is not to be ignored in this connection that Israel through its religious insight reached the conclusion of cosmic unity and harmony, not only in the formal stories of creation and in the prophets, but also in the glowing rapture of psalmists, *e.g.,* Psalms 8, 29, 104.

I have referred to the cosmopolitan experiences and universalistic ideas that appear in the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. The Bible consists of detached legends, traditions, archives, histories, biographies, sermons, hymns, moral philosophies—an apparently *distrait* collection of odd materials. But it remains unique as the one extensive volume of ancient religion, preserving, as it does, the written records of some fifteen centuries, combined not as an antiquarian corpus, but as a constant expression of faith in the divine control of all human history, to be read from one angle as a realistic philosophy of history. It may not be accidental that some thirteen centuries later the Arab Ibn Khaldun gave the world, from the rational point of view, the first essay at such a history.[13]

[12] Reference may be made to G. Sarton's volumes on the *History of Science,* and the journal under his editorship, *Isis.* In the volume in honor of W. G. Leland *Studies in the History of Science* (1942), E. A. Speiser presents (pp. 51 ff.) a fresh survey of "Some Sources of Intellectual and Social Progress in the Ancient East."

[13] See N. Schmidt, *Ibn Khaldun* (1930).

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CHIASMUS FOR INTERPRETATION

N. W. LUND

North Park Theological Seminary

By CHIASMUS the ancient grammarians meant a literary figure in which the terms in a sentence were inverted, or placed crosswise. The words of Jesus in Matt. 6:34 illustrate the principle:

> Be not therefore anxious / for the morrow,
> For the morrow / will be anxious for itself.

If we now draw lines between the related words these lines will make a Greek letter *chi*. Of this simple form there are many examples both in ancient and modern authors, both in poetry and prose. In the Scriptures, however, the principle of inversion has been employed by writers much more extensively, and in a variety of artistic combinations. Not only are there a greater number of terms involved, but the principle of inversion is applied to lines and even to whole paragraphs in a discourse. This form turns up with equal frequency in poetry and in prose, not merely in exalted passages with a deep emotional appeal but in rather prosaic and matter-of-fact statements in which a modern writer would least of all concern himself with style (cf. Col. 4:16).

It would be impossible in a brief article to discuss all the ramifications of such a far-reaching principle of style and its significance for interpretation of the New Testament.[1] When a great mass of available material is analyzed, however, it becomes increasingly clear that for the understanding of the meaning of some passages, for the checking of some old problems of the text and the raising of new questions, and for a literary appreciation of the New Testament writings themselves a study of chiasmus is likely to yield some important results.

One of the best known passages in the New Testament in which the inverted order aids in interpretation is Matt. 7:6:

> Give not that which is holy unto the *dogs*,
> Neither cast your pearls before the *swine*,
> Lest haply they *trample* them under their feet,
> And they turn and *rend* you.

The two central and the two extreme lines are obviously to be connected, for swine trample and dogs rend. We read in I Cor. 6:11,

[1] Cf. N. W. Lund, *Chiasmus in the New Testament* (University of North Carolina Press, 1942). This book may be used for more extensive passages which illustrate some statements in this article.

But ye were sanctified,
  But ye were justified
  In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ,
And in the Spirit of our God.

In the discussion that has centred around the distribution of the verbs in this passage chiasmus seems to favor "sanctified in the Spirit" and "justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ" (Acts 13:39). In Philemon vs. 5 there is also disagreement among the commentators.

Hearing of thy love
  And of the faith
  Which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus,
And toward all the saints.

Should "faith" be given the usual theological meaning in Paul, or should it be interpreted as "faithfulness"? Though the latter alternative certainly can claim support from Paul's letters, the former seems preferable in this case.

Rom. 11:33-36 is one of the often quoted passages, yet there is a disagreement about the punctuation and construction of this passage which has found expression in the versions. The punctuation of the Authorized and American Revised versions is obviously wrong, however attractive it may be grammatically, and the suggestion of the margin should be adopted. The chiastic form of this passage makes the choice compulsory.

O the depth of the *riches,*
  And of the *wisdom,*
    And of the *knowledge* of *God!*
      How unsearchable his judgments,
      And past tracing out his ways!
    For who hath *known* the mind of the *Lord?*
  Or who hath been his *counsellor?*
Or who hath first *given* him,
And it shall be recompensed unto him again?

For of him, and through him, and unto him, are all things.
To him be the glory for ever. Amen.

The meaning of the passage may be expressed as follows: "For who hath known the mind of the Lord," in whom there is such a depth of knowledge? "Or who hath been his counsellor," in whom there is such a depth of wisdom? "Or who hath first given him," in whom there is such a depth of riches? The arrangement of the terms, "his judgments" and "his ways," at the end of the central lines, as well as the divine names at the end of the lines closest to the centre, serve to give emphasis to the turning point in the system.

Epigrams and paradoxes always have a striking form; in fact, one always suspects that it is their pointed form no less than their content that make them live in the memories of men. In recent years the students of form history have focused the attention of New Testament students on the individual units that make up our gospels, and efforts have been made to distinguish between what is original and what is the accretions of a later tradition. Even in this area the observance of chiastic forms may be of some interest. Take the words of Jesus in Matt. 10:39 and in Matt. 23:12.[2]

He that findeth
His life
Shall lose it;
And he that loseth
His life for my sake
Shall find it.

And whosoever shall exalt
Himself
Shall be humbled;
And whosoever shall humble
Himself
Shall be exalted.

In Matt. 10:39 the phrase "for my sake" is the only detail that prevents it from being as perfect in form as Matt. 23:12. One discovers at a glance that the phrase is not essential to the clearness of the paradox, as the words were originally spoken by Jesus, but that they may become necessary, when the paradox is incorporated in a larger discourse for public reading. The phrase is absent in the version of the saying which occurs in Luke 17:33, but is found with still another explanatory phrase added to it in Mark 8:35 ("for the gospel's"). In Luke 17:33 Tischendorf's digest of readings shows that while many good manuscripts have two different verbs, D has the *same* verb in both places for "preserve," and probably for that reason comes closer to the original. Matt. 23:12 turns up again in Luke 14:11; 18:14 with only slight modifications. When one deals with paradoxes, one naturally accepts as the original the form which is most pointed, and other forms, less well-knit and somewhat blunted, as later modifications. Yet, it is impossible to avoid subjectivity in all such judgments.

There are also many instances in which the centre is a single line, without companion, and parallel ideas and even identical terms are distributed in the central and in the two extreme lines. The briefest possible example of this type is found in I Cor. 12:12.[3]

For as the *body* is one
And hath many members,
And all the members of the *body,*
Being many,
Are one *body,* so also Christ.

[2] These passages are discussed in their context in *Chiasmus in the New Testament,* pp. 265, 268, 283, 286.

[3] *Op. cit.,* pp. 165, 172, where the setting of the passage is given.

If this passage is somewhat repetitious, it is not due to the looseness of the writer's style, but to the chiastic pattern, which is his literary habit. To one who is imbued with Greek rhetorical form such repetitions seem less desirable, but to a writer who is steeped in the Old Testament they have become his second nature. An interesting comparison may be made between the Q material as it occurs in Matthew and in Luke. Many instances of chiasmus in Matthew are considerably or slightly modified in Luke. By the change of order, by elimination of a phrase, by substituting another verb, when in Matthew the same verb occurs twice in perfect balance, or by some other device Luke introduces variety where Matthew repeats (cf. Matt. 10:39 with Lk. 17:33). The only way to deal with this alleged repetitiousness is to treat it as another kind of style, originating in the older Semitic culture of which many of the writers of the New Testament were the heirs. The following two passages from Matt. 5:23, 24 and Rev. 10:9b-10 show the distribution of parallel ideas in the centre and the extreme lines:

If therefore thou art offering *thy gift* upon the altar,
And rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee,
Leave there *thy gift* before the altar,
And go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother,
And then come and offer *thy gift.*

Take it and *eat it up,* and it shall make bitter thy belly,
But in thy mouth it shall be sweet as honey;
And I took the little book out of the angel's hand and *ate it up.*
And it was in my mouth sweet as honey,
And when *I had eaten it,* was made bitter my belly.

These two systems of lines are well-knit and clearly set off from their respective contexts. They are literary units even though they are intimately related to the larger symmetry of which they are but a part.[4] Now this particular method of distributing parallel ideas in a system constitutes a new fact which may be used as a tool in New Testament interpretation. Since the days of Augustine there has been a lively debate about the number of beatitudes. Augustine himself says that they are seven, and yet has to recognize the fact that there is an eighth;[5] and he might even have considered the possibility of a ninth beatitude. If, however, we separate the seven beatitudes which are similar in structure in a class by themselves, we shall soon discover that the following words are easily grouped into a separate well-knit system of lines which is quite complete and constitutes a separate literary unit with a characteristic triplet of verbs in the centre and parallel ideas distributed in the centre and in the extremes (Matt. 5:10-12).[6]

[4] Lund, *op. cit.*, pp. 243, 256 and 391, 393.
[5] *The Sermon on the Mount* i, 2 (end).
[6] Lund, *op. cit.;* cf. list of passages in index under "Centre and extremes."

Blessed are they that have been *persecuted* for righteousness' sake,
For theirs is the kingdom of *heaven.*
Blessed are ye,
When they shall *reproach* you,
And *persecute* you,
And *say* all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake.
Rejoice and be exceeding glad,
For great is your reward in *heaven,*
For thus *persecuted* they the prophets that were before you.

To be sure, the number of beatitudes cannot be regarded as one of the major problems of New Testament criticism, and yet it is one of those tantalizing questions that often present themselves and always defy us when we seek an answer. Punctuating and paragraphing in the New Testament may, under certain conditions, be done more accurately by observing the natural subdivisions of such systems of lines.

In an address to German pastors many years ago the late Johannes Weiss discussed the tasks of New Testament interpretation. In dealing with the question of style and the structure of the sentence Weiss raises the question whether the Greek language to Paul is "a cloth-covering under which the Jew everywhere comes into view or it is his mother tongue." The difference between such passages as I Cor. 7 and Col. 1 creates a problem for him, and he goes on to state it in the following words:

> Here arises the question for me, which has oppressed me more than many other problems: How can the selfsame man write so differently? How is it possible that a handwriting is so changed? Here, it appears to me, is a pressing problem which in our time has small chance of solution. It waits for a quiet scholar, who, far from the strife of the world, with love and good taste, with care and intimacy, is able to hear these distinctions and will give of them a satisfactory solution.[7]

These words from a great scholar, who himself contributed so much to the understanding of Paul's style, are significant. However much we may long for a nook where "the strife of the world" does not penetrate, most of us are doomed to work in the turbulent city, made more noisy every day by modern invention. But perhaps even there we may listen and "hear these distinctions," and not only that, but the underlying harmonies as well in passages that too often are declared to be far apart. Not only in Colossians but in Ephesians also, which many scholars consider so far removed from the Pauline epistles as to preclude its Pauline authorship, do we find that chiastic forms have penetrated. Considerations of space prevent printing more than one longer passage, but it is a significant passage. Eph. 2:11-22 deals with the new unity of the church which now has superseded former relations to Judaism.

[7] J. Weiss, *Die Aufgabe der neutestamentlichen Wissenschafft* (Göttingen, 1908), pp. 11-15.

Wherefore remember that once ye, the gentiles in the flesh, 11
A Who are called Uncircumcision
By that which is called Circumcision,
In the flesh, made with hands;

That ye were at that time *separate* from Christ, 12
Alienated from the commonwealth of Israel,
B And strangers from the covenants of promise,
Having no hope,
And without God in the world.
But now in Christ Jesus ye that once were far off 13
are *made nigh* in the blood of Christ.

For he is our *peace,* 14
Who made both *one,* [and brake down the middle wall of partition,
In his flesh, the enmity],
C The law of commandments in ordinances having abolished, 15
That he might create of *the two*
In himself
One new man,
Making *peace;*

And might reconcile them *both in one body* with God 16
Through the cross, [having slain the enmity thereby;]
peace to you who were *far off,*
C′ And coming he brought good tidings of 17
and *peace* to them that were *nigh;*
For through him 18
We *both* have our access *in one Spirit* to the Father.

So then ye are no more strangers 19
A′ And sojourners,
But fellow-citizens with the saints,
And of the household of God;

Being *built* upon the foundation of the apostles and the prophets, 20
Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone,
In whom 21
Each several building,
B′ Fitly framed together, groweth
Into a holy temple in the Lord,
In whom 22
Ye also are *builded* together for a habitation of God in the Spirit.

In Eph. 2:11-22 the new relationship of the saints to Judaism is described. Formerly separated by insurmountable barriers of race and customs Jew and gentile are now made one. This new unity is a "new man," a new creation by Christ's redemptive work on the cross, and the results in human society are far-reaching. By printing the passage in this fashion certain details stand out more clearly. In the first place

there are paragraphs that stand in striking contrast to other paragraphs. In A the former distinction or Jew and gentile, their separateness, is set forth, and in A′ the new unity of one great household of God. In the B the dispossessed state of the gentiles under the old order is described in terms of the Jewish heritage, but in B′ the privileges of the gentiles under the new order are sketched under the metaphor of the new temple. While there is inversion of lines within these sections, their relation to one another is *alternating* (ABA′B′). These four paragraphs enclose two central paragraphs which are devoted to a statement of the basis of the new order, namely, the redemptive work of Christ on the cross. These two sections are most interesting as specimens of careful artistic writing. They are what, for want of a better term, may be called *twin sections,* and they are intimately related in structure. Terms and ideas which occur in the centre of one section are placed in the extremes of the other. The word "peace" which occurs twice in the extreme lines of C is found twice in the centre of C′. Conversely the emphasis on "the two" which is found in the centre of C is balanced by "both" in the two extreme lines of C′. The same law of the shift—as it might be called for want of a better term—is observable in the two terms "far off" and "nigh" in the centre of C′, for these ideas are found in the extreme lines of B in strong antithesis. Having already observed these instances of interrelationship of these sections one strongly suspects that the abolishment of the "commandments in ordinances" mentioned in the centre of C is designed to be balanced by a new authority designated as the new foundation of "apostles and (N.T.) prophets," on the one hand, and the new habitation of God "in the Spirit," on the other, which are presented in the extremes of B′. To the reader who for the first time makes the acquaintance of these forms in this article these statements probably will seem farfetched and extremely fanciful. But there is much more evidence of the employment of such intricate literary patterns both in the Old and in the New Testaments.[8]

Some remarks should be made with reference to the words placed in brackets (vss. 14, 16). In both instances the word "enmity" occurs in the second line of each system, and the suggestion is made that possibly we have here two early glosses. The text reads well without them, the chiastic structure will not tolerate them, and there are other similar cases in Ephesians.[9] Yet, as a check, it is well to remember that no literary form is *always* perfect.

Other literary mannerisms of this passage point in two directions. In the first place Ephesians is closely related to Colossians in its whole

[8] *Op. cit.,* p. 202 (on Eph. 6: 5-9).
[9] *Op. cit.,* pp. 200, 205; see also Index: Chiasmus, in textual criticism.

structure. Yet there are more subtle ways in which the relationship is revealed. Take the allocation of terms in the centre of B′ "framed together, groweth." The first of these terms refers to the joints of masonry in a building, the other to any growth in the field, here used metaphorically of the building. When "framed together" turns up again in 4:16 in company with "knit together," it is again found in the centre, and with "grow" properly balanced in parallel lines:

But speaking truth *in love*
May *grow* in all things into him,
Who is the *head,* Christ;
From whom *all* the body
Fitly framed and knit together
Through *every* joint of the supply,
According to the working in a measure of each several *member,*
Maketh the *growth* of the body
Unto the building up of itself *in love.*

Now this literary mannerism of placing two terms, both of them descriptive of the church's development, in the centre of a structure recurs in two systems in Colossians (1:6, 10), though the similarity is somewhat hidden by the translation "bearing fruit and increasing" (growing).[10]

In the second place the literary mannerisms also point to I Corinthians. In Eph. 3:17 the words "in love rooted and grounded" are likely to hide rather than reveal the fact that the two participles point to widely divergent activities. If we render "rooted and founded," the mixed nature of the metaphors stands out more clearly. In Col. 2:7 we find the combination "rooted and builded up." In view of previous observations it is remarkable that both these instances of mixture, the one referring to the organic growth of life and the other to the—shall we say—organizational activities of building operations, should again turn up in central position in their respective structures.[11] That it is not an ordinary case of mixed metaphor due to careless writing is evident. These two aspects of the growth of the church stand out clearly in the well-known passage in I Cor. 3:5-17, the very centre of the long passage occupying the first four chapters of the epistle in which Paul discusses the cause and cure of divisions in the church. The passage is a good example of the *alternating* arrangement of paragraphs, a type which frequently is found in combination with chiastic patterns.

[10] *Op. cit.,* pp. 207, 208.

[11] For other examples of key terms in the centre of structures cf. *op. cit.,* pp. 204, 205, and Index.

The Remedy against the Divisions (I Cor. 3: 5-17)

A
What then is Apollos? 5
And what is Paul?
Ministers through whom ye believed;
And to *each* as the Lord *gave.*

B
I planted, 6
Apollos watered;
But God gave the growth.
So that neither is he that planteth anything, 7
Nor he that watereth;
But God that giveth the growth.

C
Now he that planteth 8
And he that watereth are one,
But each shall *receive his own reward*
According to *his own labor.*

D
For *God's* fellow-workers *are we;* 9
God's tilled land,
God's building *are ye.*

A′
According to the grace of God which *was given* me, 10
As a wise masterbuilder a foundation I laid;
But another buildeth thereon.
But let *each* see to it how he buildeth thereon.

B′
For another foundation no one can lay 11
Than the one which is laid,
Which is Jesus Christ.
But if any one buildeth upon the foundation, 12
Gold, silver, costly stones,
Wood, hay, stubble—

Each one's work shall be made manifest, 13
For the day shall declare it,
Because it is revealed in fire;
And *each one's work,* of what sort it is, the fire shall prove it.

C′
If *any one's work* shall abide which he built thereon, 14
He shall *receive reward.*
If *any one's work* shall be burned down, 15
He shall suffer loss.
But he himself shall be saved,
Yet as through fire.

D′
Know ye not that the sanctuary of *God ye are,* 16
And that the Spirit of *God* in you dwelleth?
If any one the sanctuary of *God* destroyeth, 17
Him shall *God* destroy.
For the sanctuary of *God* is holy,
Which *ye are.*

The dissensions among the members of the Corinthian church were caused by that particular kind of hero worship which made the members incapable of appreciating any one else than their own chosen hero (I Cor. 1:12). The cure for this particular kind of immaturity of the Christian mind is found in the realization that both the ministers and the church are God's property and not man's. This thesis is emphatically stated in vs. 9, where the triplet gives us the clue to the turning point in the structure. The church is God's *farm* and God's *building,* the apostles are God's *partners.* Here we have again side by side the two figures which we have met before in the terms "rooted and founded" and "rooted and builded up." They evidently stand for two separate aspects of the church, organic growth of spiritual life, on the one hand, and organizational activities, increase of membership, etc., on the other. The difference in talent or personality among the ministers is due to their separate divine endowment, "to each as the Lord gave" (A). This idea is again repeated in A′, but Paul's activity is mentioned first, and then Apollos', which is an inversion of the order in A. The watering and planting of the field in B is matched by the laying of the foundation and the building of the house in B′. There are no identical *terms* in these two sections, yet the general idea is sufficiently clear. Sections C and C′ discuss each man's work and reward with a special emphasis on the individual nature of each. As C′ is more lengthy than C it is also of greater solemnity. The work of the ministry is evidently to be viewed in the light of *der Tag,* which shall test all the works of men (vs. 13). The fivefold repetition of the divine name in D′ also points to the serious nature of the divisions. Since both churches and ministers are God's own possession, any hostile action against them will bring sure destruction.

That Paul in such a discussion should go over the same subject twice, employing two separate figures of speech, is a remarkable example of the penetration of the principle of Hebrew parallelism in his mind. Were it not for the fact that expository preaching is no longer popular in many circles, one might suggest that observations of this kind could help the minister to a good, clear, biblical sermon; and, incidentally, make him view himself and his work more objectively, thus helping him to escape the pitfalls of hero worship, and to teach his people to understand that of necessity there must be different talents and personalities, yet all of them subordinated under a common unified purpose—the welfare of the whole church of God.

For several decades New Testament scholars have come increasingly to appreciate the influence of current Greek culture upon the writings of the New Testament. In *Studien und Kritiken,* 1922, pp. 55-95, Edvard Lehmann, of the University of Lund, and Anton Fridrichsenn, of the Uni-

versity of Oslo, published a joint article, "I Kor. 13, eine christlich-stoische Diatribe." There are many striking similarities between the Stoic diatribe and many sections of the Pauline epistles, as Rudolf Bultmann has shown conclusively. The long lists of virtues and vices which turn up here and there in the New Testament also have their parallels in the writings of the Greek moralists. Dr. Anton Vögtle's *Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im N.T.*[12] (Münster, Aschendorff, 1936), is a very interesting and exhaustive study of this particular phase of the subject. One can easily understand how Christian teachers should avail themselves of teaching techniques which already had been popularized by the Stoic moralists in the Greek world. It would be a mistake, however, to assume that they just took over without modification these forms of expression. Even in these lists one observes traces of rhetorical principles characteristic of the Old Testament. The principle of inversion and of the shift of significant terms, when they again recur in a balanced position, can be established.

In I Cor. 5:9—6:20 Paul deals with the problems of fornication and litigation in the Corinthian church. The section on litigation (6:1-8) is injected in a most disconcerting manner in the midst of the discussion of fornication. One might feel tempted to describe it, using an expression of Johannes Weiss, as "hanging loosely in its rivets," were it not for the principle of inversion with which we have already become acquainted. On either side of this section we have lists of sins characteristic of gentile society, and a study of their literary arrangement is most illuminating.

The Duty of Separation (I Cor. 5: 9-13)

I wrote you in my epistle not *to keep company* with fornicators, 9
Not at all with the fornicators of *this world* 10
Or with covetous,
A Or extortioners,
Or idolaters,
For then ye must needs go out of *this world.*
But now *I wrote you* not *to keep company* 11

If any man that is named *a brother* be
A fornicator,
Or covetous,
B Or an idolater,
Or a reviler,
Or a drunkard,
Or an extortioner,
With *such an one* no, not to eat.

For what have I to do with judging them that are *without?* 12
A′ Do not ye judge them that are *within?*
But them that are *without* God judgeth. 13
Put away the wicked man from among *yourselves.*

[12] I am indebted to Dr. Burton S. Easton, of New York, who called my attention to this important book.

The Duty of Separation (I Cor. 6: 9-11)

Or know ye not that the unrighteous *shall not inherit the kingdom of God?* 9
Be not deceived:
Neither fornicators,
Nor idolaters,
A { Nor adulterers,
Nor effeminate,
Nor abusers of themselves with men,
Nor thieves, 10
Nor covetous,
Nor drunkards,
Nor revilers,
Nor extortioners,
Shall inherit the kingdom of God.
And such were some of you, but ye washed yourselves. 11

But ye were sanctified,
A′ But ye were justified,
In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ,
And in the Spirit of our God.

In the first of these passages (5:9-13) Paul corrects a misunderstanding. His advice about company in a previous letter had been given too wide an interpretation; it had reference to church members only (cf. A). This section is a well-knit chiastic structure. In A′ the same distinction is made between those that are without and those that are within, but the lines are alternating, not chiastic. There are in all *ten* terms in A and B that list the vices of pagan society, but four are used twice. There is a central triplet in A in which "covetous" and "idolater," though separated, are parallel. They stand together in B. One is tempted to join "fornicators" and "extortioners" in A, for they bracket the other four terms in B, but the phrases "to keep company" and "this world" are too pronounced to be disregarded in the structure.

When we turn to the parallel passage in 6:9-11 we observe the strong antithesis between the terms "kingdom of God" and "this world," both of them occurring twice in their respective sections. We find again *ten* terms, this time without any repetition. Why "fornicator" and "extortioner" should be made to bracket the other four terms in 5:11 becomes clear when we observe that these terms are made to bracket the intervening terms also in 6:9-11 (cf. A). "Idolater" and "reviler," which stand together in the centre of B in 5:9-13, are most widely separated in A in 6:9-11. Conversely, "covetous" and "drunkard," which are separated by two terms in B in 5:9-13, stand side by side in A in 6:9-11. Adulterers, effeminates, abusers of themselves with men, and thieves, which are newly introduced, stand in a group together, and cannot possibly enter into the investigation of relationships, since they are not found in 5:9-13. If this group of four terms is tentatively lifted out, a closer study of the position

of the six remaining terms that are common to both passages shows that the arrangement is governed by the old familiar law of the shift, which we have already had occasion to observe in the two central sections CC′ in Eph. 2:11-22.

A fornicator,
Or covetous,
Or an idolater,
Or a reviler,
Or a drunkard,
Or an extortioner (5:11).

Neither fornicators,
Nor idolaters,
Nor covetous,
Nor drunkards,
Nor revilers,
Nor extortioners (6:9*b*-10*a*).

A comparison of the two passages shows beyond doubt that, when the writer has given a list of vices in the first passage, he is conscious of a definite literary pattern when he writes the second passage; and he reproduces this pattern with appropriate variations which, nevertheless, follow ascertainable laws of composition. It would be wrong to conclude from such lists that their arrangement is confined to such materials only. Very frequently passages that contain a number of other items are found to be according to definite literary patterns. When this evidence has been examined we must conclude that the lists of virtues and vices in the New Testament are not isolated instances, but are part of a larger whole, an all-embracing literary convention, whose formal literary antecedents are to be traced to Semitic, not to Greek, culture.

I Cor. 4:7-13 is a remarkable passage, deeply emotional with mingled sorrow and sarcasm, in which Paul rebukes the pride and deflates the self-esteem of the Corinthians. There cannot be the least doubt about the emotional upheaval that caused this passage to be written, but even under these conditions a perfect mastery of form is maintained throughout.

For who maketh thee to differ? 7
And what has thou that thou didst not *receive?*
But if thou didst *receive* it,
Why dost thou glory as if thou hadst not *received* it

Already ye are filled; 8
A Already ye are become rich.
Without us ye are come to *reign;*
Yea, and I would that ye did *reign,*
That also we *with you* might *reign.*
For, I think, God hath set forth us the apostles last as doomed to death; 9
For we are made a spectacle to the world, both to angels and to men.

We are fools for the sake of Christ, 10
But *ye* are wise in Christ;
B *We* are weak,
But *ye* are strong;
Ye have glory,
But *we* dishonor.

Even until this present hour 11
We both hunger
And thirst;
And are naked,
And are buffeted,
And have no certain dwelling place.
A′ And we toil, 12
Working with our hands.
Being reviled, we bless;
Being persecuted, we endure;
Being defamed, we entreat. 13
As the filth of the world we are made
Of all (men) the offscouring
Until now.

The phrase "until now" shows how rigidly the writer maintains the inverted order, even when the phrase adds nothing new but merely repeats what has already been said. The time element expressed in the two bracketing lines is probably designed to refute the sly suggestion that Paul had profited from his ministry. In A′ there is a definite numerical grouping of the statements in 2 3 2 3 2 lines. "Hunger" and "thirst" are obviously a pair, and so are their parallels, "filth" and "offscouring." "We toil" is explained by the following participial construction, "working with our hands." This leaves three statements on either side of the centre. The first of these triplets describes what the apostles passively endure of suffering, and the second shows what they actively contribute in return for indignities heaped upon them. The latter triplet should be connected with the thrice-repeated "receive" in vs. 7 above, and the former triplet with the thrice-repeated "reign" in vs. 8. This is merely the strong contrast between the Corinthians' and the apostle's condition which has already been presented in a different way in the two outer couplets of vss. 8, 9. They are filled and rich, Paul doomed to death and a spectacle to angels and to men! We have thus in A also a numerical alternation of 2 3 2, and yet another 3 in vs. *7b*. The alternation of the personal pronouns in B is a rather striking feature. That they are expressed at all makes the passage emphatic, and that they occur at the beginning of the lines adds to this already strong emphasis. The great surprise comes when "we" and "ye," already twice repeated, have their order suddenly reversed to "ye" and "we" in the last two lines of B. This inversion is accompanied by another, for "fools" and "wise" are matched by "glory" and "dishonor." The sarcasm of this brief passage is hard to surpass in writing, a testimony to the deep humiliation inflicted upon Paul by the inflated Corinthians.

One of the finest examples of minute artistic ingenuity in the composition of long lists is provided by the long description of the commodities in which Babylon traded (Rev. 18:10*b*-17*a*). Many things have been

said and written about the Book of Revelation, but few scholars have had any high regard for its literary style. The truth of the whole matter is that the book is a highly artistic production, once the principles of its art are regarded as legitimate and the book is studied according to its own presuppositions. The description of Babylon's trade is only one of many similar panels in the book. There are three textual adjustments made in this list. The material in vs. 14 is removed by B. Weiss to vs. 23 and by R. H. Charles to vs. 21, both scholars agreeing that the verse is out of place in its present position. This independent critical judgment of the two scholars is confirmed by a study of the structure. The terms "stone" and "myrrh" have been added to the list for reasons that will appear presently. In H. C. Hoskier's monumental work *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse* (London, 1929) a number of minuscules and Pseudo-Ambrosiaster (Berengaud, flourished *ca.* 800 A.D.) are cited for the reading "marble and crystal" instead of "marble and cinnamon" (Vol. 2, p. 240). Two fifteenth-century manuscripts (2036, 2037) carry the word "myrrh," and Tishendorf's digest adds Andreas, a commentator in the second half of the sixth century, as authority for this term. Whatever the ultimate critical value of these indications may be, they show that copyists have had some difficulties with the text as we now have it. The list is definitely one of *pairs,* with the exception of the central section D, where the usual triplet occurs, and the literary pattern as well as a consideration for symbolism in numbers requires that the pairs be kept intact and not be turned into triplets as Charles does.

The Lament over Babylon (Rev. 18: 10-17)

A
Woe, woe, 10
The great city,
Babylon,
The strong city,
For *in one hour* is thy judgment come.

B
And *the merchants* of the earth *weep and mourn* over her, 11
For no man buyeth their merchandise any more, merchandise

C
of gold 12
And of *silver,*
And of precious stone
And of pearls,
And of fine linen
And of purple,
And of *silk*
And of scarlet;

D
And *every* thyine *wood,*
And *every* vessel of ivory,
And *every* vessel made of most precious *wood;*

C′
And of brass
And of iron,
And of marble
(And of stone);

And cinnamon 13
And amomum,
And incense
And ointment,
And frankincense
(And myrrh);

And wine
And oil,
And fine flour
And wheat,
And cattle
And sheep;

And of horses
And of chariots,
And of bodies
And souls of men.

(14)

B′ *The merchants* of these things, who were made rich by her, 15
Shall stand afar off for fear of her torment, *weeping and mourning,* saying,

A′
Woe, woe, the *great* city, 16
She that was arrayed in { fine linen / and purple / and scarlet,
And decked with { gold / and precious stone / and pearl!
For in *one hour* so *great* riches is made desolate. 17

The two sections AA′ announce the woes against Babylon and the approaching hour of her doom. These sections have triplets, of which there is one in A and two in A′. The central section D also has a threefold repetition of "every." Thus we have in the centre and in the extremes triplets in accordance with a well-known law. Sections BB′ describe the weeping and mourning of the merchants over their loss of important markets for their goods. Sections CDC′ are given to an enumeration of the various items of merchandise. A careful study of the extensive digests of readings by Tischendorf, R. H. Charles, and H. C. Hoskier should convince anybody that eliminations, transpositions, and substitu-

tions in such lists are common. The various sections carry common terms that make them parallel. But in addition to this parallelism there is a more intricate cross pattern which the author has worked out with great care and skill. Section C with its content of *eight* items is obviously related to A′ which has only *six* items. In A′, however, the author eliminates two of the items of C, silver and silk. This is also done according to a definite method, for one of these items occurs second in order from the head, and the other, second from the bottom of the list. Having thus obtained two triplets, he proceeds to invert them in A′ in the regular chiastic fashion.

Having discovered such an intimate relationship between A′ and C, one naturally raises the question whether something similar can be worked out with reference to A and C′. The very principle of the cross pattern seems to call for some such parallelism between A and C′. In A two epithets are used to describe Babylon: "the great city" and "the strong city." Only one of these turns up in A′, and there it is parallel to "great riches." Can it be that "great" is here related to the elements of wealth? Such use of the adjective is not unknown in the Old Testament (cf. I Sam. 25:2; II Sam. 19:32 [LXX]). If so, may not the other adjective "strong" be definitely related to the elements of power?

Turning to the list in C′, we discover that it starts out with a cluster of words, two pairs (if a companion to "marble" is allowed), and these four are in the *genitive* case. These genitives are again resumed in the *last* four items in the list, where there cannot be any doubt that we have two pairs. R. H. Charles starts out correctly with pairs, but is beguiled by the obvious triplet in D to continue with triplets to the end.[13] In the last cluster of four he objects to the sudden change from accusatives to genitives (Vol. II, p. 102). But these troubles are of his own making, for the list opens and closes with four genitives, while the middle clusters in C′ of six lines each, the favorite number twelve, are all in the *accusative* case.[14] If we now examine the contents of the two bracketing clusters of four in the genitive case, we find that they all set forth those things that make Rome a "strong city." The intervening two clusters in the accusative case set forth articles of wealth, six of which are luxuries and six necessities. Even the change of construction in the last item to "souls of men," to which Charles objects, is only one of those little mannerisms that often occur at the end of such systems. Their function is as mechanical as the bell of a typewriter. The cross pattern is nothing new. We found one example of it in Eph. 2:11-22, in which passage not only were CC′

[13] R. H. Charles, *The Revelation of Saint John, ICC,* Vol. II, p. 432.
[14] H. B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of Saint John,* p. 234.

related, but also C to B′ and C′ to B. There are many other such examples of verbal cross-stitching.[15]

A possible objection may be raised against treating section D as the *centre* of the structure, since there is obviously so much more material following D than preceding it. Again the reader's attention is called to the passage in I Cor. 3 : 5-17 where, though there can be no doubt where the dividing line goes, the second half is nearly twice as long as the first half. The writers show in many ways that their conception of style is not rigidly monotonous but plastic, and that in the midst of infinite variations in detail the basic literary patterns are, nevertheless, definitely maintained. To them the form is the servant, not the master of the thought.

When one observes the frequent recurrence of chiastic patterns in Ephesians and Colossians and finds that they are precisely of the same quality as those occurring in the other epistles of Paul, one is inclined to think of these epistles that were formerly "afar off" as having now "come nigh." A similar impression will be created, if one compares the Book of Revelation with the epistles of Paul. Is it not possible that in stressing the differences between these writings scholars have lost sight of a deep underlying literary unity? Again, if we call Ephesians a "liturgical" document, because of its stylistic quality, what prevents us from including Colossians in the same category? And why should not the category be extended so as to include I Corinthians as well?

The researches of G. A. Deissmann proved conclusively that the Greek of the New Testament was the popular language used by hellenistic Greeks in Mediterranean lands in the time of Paul. But does it necessarily follow that because the language is not literary, classic Greek, that writings in this language must be merely popular pamphlets (*Kleinliteratur*)? The great care with which the epistles of Paul are written creates a presumption in favor of the theory that the author meant them for permanent use in the churches, and that they were more than merely casual letters. Casual letters are seldom written with painstaking care. That these epistles contain literary patterns already made familiar through the writings of the Old Testament, which were used liturgically in the synagogue and in the church, strongly supports the theory that the epistles themselves were intended for a similar use.

The liturgical use of chiastic patterns may be traced to the Old Testament, and in this use we have, no doubt, the clue to their historic origin.[16] There are at least three separate rituals outlined in Lev. 14 : 10-20, 21-32, and 49-53, in which the procedure is prescribed for ritual cleansing

[15] Lund, *op. cit., pp.* 340, 351, *et al.*

[16] Cf. (*op. cit.*), pp. 52-57 with pp. 236, 237.

from leprosy. In each instance the act begins by the preparation of the materials needed, then proceeds in six of seven steps to its climax, when the blood is sprinkled seven times before Yahweh, and finally recedes to the point where it began in a perfect, inverted order. The ritual is obviously older than the liturgy that prescribes it. Long before there were any liturgical writings we have ritual acts. Why the concluding steps in the ritual should be inverted in order may be explained from a very early and very natural feeling for balance and rhythm. As one observes a folk dance, one frequently discovers that a movement of a person, or a couple, in one part of the field will soon call forth a similar movement by the same persons, or their partners, in the opposite side of the field. Such feeling for symmetry is in the nature of things, and there is much of this balance to be observed in nearly all types of ritual in the church and outside of it. But here, as in all beginnings, there is "darkness upon the face of the deep," preventing us from seeing things clearly. Once well established in the ritual, the inverted order would make its way into the liturgical writings as a sacred form which was to be carefully preserved. It is easy to conjecture how such a form would later become established in literature, especially since this literature dealt with sacred subjects, as was the case among the ancient Hebrews. From the synagogue to the church the transition was made easy by the fact that most of the New Testament writers were Jews. When the necessity to present distinctive Christian teaching in written form arose, the pattern already made sacred by association with the Scriptures of the Old Testament and by public use in the synagogue was almost unconsciously adopted.

ARE BAPTISTS GOING TO ROME?

ROBERT A. ASHWORTH

Lecturer on Baptist Polity, Union Theological Seminary

PROFESSOR ENSLIN'S article of October, 1942, "Roger Williams Goes to Rome" is reported to be "the most popular article ever published in the CROZER QUARTERLY." It has been separately printed and widely distributed and is said to have been acclaimed by Baptist leaders both in the South and in the North as a wholesome corrective to dangerous tendencies within the denomination which are alarming to many.

The total impression made upon this reader, however, is that the author disapproves of anything in Baptist practice or belief of more recent date than that of Roger Williams. The implication appears to be that it is dangerous for Baptists to learn or grow or change. To adopt a phraseology different from that of the earliest Baptists, the author seems to be saying, is a sign of declension and apostasy. The old words, the old style architecture, the old time symbolism, and old modes of worship are sacrosanct.

Such conservative attachment to the old and familiar is natural and widespread. The theology of some is shaped by it. For others it controls their interpretation of the Bible. For still others their ritual observances are shaped by it and every small detail of religious practice or belief. But natural and widespread though it may be, it, too, has its dangers. It might be claimed, with some show of reason, that if Baptists have not changed somewhat in three hundred years it is to be deplored. To learn nothing and to forget nothing is not the way to adapt one's self to a changing world.

The nub of the charge that Professor Enslin brings against some of his fellow Baptists appears to be that they are adopting some of the beliefs and practices of other Christian bodies. He stigmatizes it as "the aping of the rites of other communions with the real significance, good or bad as the case may be, disguised or sugar-coated."

On the other hand, if Baptists have learned nothing since the days of Roger Williams from the great multitude of their fellow Christians by whom they are surrounded, it is not to their credit. We do not claim to have a monopoly of truth. After all, Baptists constitute one of the smaller Christian sects. How many of us are there? Twelve millions? That is a small fraction of the 150 millions of Protestant Christians, or of the 450 million non-Roman Christians. It is hardly to be supposed that in this great army only Baptists are in step.

Whether Baptists are Protestants is a moot question in the minds of some. By some it is denied. But it is certain they were moved at the start to protest against certain doctrines and practices that they believed

to be contrary to the teaching of the New Testament. It is at least possible, as it would be quite natural, that they leaned over backward in their protest, and let some things go which they might better have retained. It is at least possible that in rightly rejecting certain practices they lost certain spiritual values that these practices were meant to express, that they poured out the baby with the bath. That is at least conceivable, and we should not close our minds to that possibility. "I beseech you by the mercies of Christ," said Melancthon to Luther when discussing a question related to this, "think it possible you may be mistaken."

Any doctrine or rite that is accepted for centuries by multitudes of Christians, many of them as devout and intelligent as any among ourselves, has surely something to be said for it. It cannot be laughed off, or lightly dismissed. It may be well to remind ourselves that there are many millions of devoted Christians who have been fully exposed to the Baptist witness who are still not in the least convinced by it. This need not shake our faith that we are right in our distinctive contentions, but it might raise a doubt in our minds whether we have all the truth and whether there may not be something in the heritage of other faiths which we should do well to borrow. It surely will if we are humble and teachable, if, like Roger Williams, we keep our minds open to new truth. Roger Williams early left the Baptists and became a "Seeker." Could he not have stayed in the Baptist fold and still have been a seeker? It is well for us occasionally to look to "the pit whence we were digged"; it is not well for us to remain there, to make it our home. We ought at least to look over the edge of it.

Professor Enslin tells us that we must not call the Lord's supper a "sacrament" or even "holy communion." We must not use the term "sacrament" because it smacks of a magical conception of the ordinance. That will be startling to many of our fellow Protestants. An overwhelming majority of our Protestant brethren employ the word "sacrament" and would reject as firmly as do Baptists the idea of magic. And why not "holy communion"? It is certainly a communion and it ought to be holy to us all. Thus to designate the Lord's supper is not to take a single step toward Rome.

Our rejection of these terms has perhaps contributed to our cheapening of the ordinance. Unless Baptists can discover a deeper spiritual significance in the two ordinances that they observe, baptism and the Lord's supper, they will lose them. Already baptism is on the way out in ever widening Baptist circles. It does nothing for us, so why observe it? And the Lord's supper will go the same way and for the same reason. If it is not a means of grace more than any service of worship, if it is not essential to the existence of the church, if it is no more than a memorial—then there are other ways to keep green the memory of our Lord. Is there

any other Christian body whose doctrine of the sacraments or ordinances is as *low* as that of the Baptists? To most Christians the sacrament of "holy communion" is the centre of their spiritual life. They seem, at least, really to receive something at the Lord's table. Have we lost something there? It is well for us at least to ask the question.

Professor Enslin objects to the presence of the cross in a Baptist church—or shall we say chapel? The point of his objection appears to be that the presence of the cross seems to introduce an element of "sanctity" into the house of worship. Indeed, he does not stress the function of worship in the maintenance of Christian living. Only reluctantly does he conform to current usage in using the word *church* in the sense of a building set apart for public worship. He would greatly prefer the more apt *meeting house.* He seems to like *auditorium,* since "the sermon is the central feature" in a service of worship. This he "blatantly and unshamefacedly" emphasizes. "Brains and ears" play a prominent part in a service, he says, and it is to their satisfaction that the efforts of the minister should be directed.

Well, that is a point of view, and it is, perhaps, shared by many, and should be given weight. There are, however, multitudes who go to church not merely nor primarily to have their brains and ears gratified. They may, indeed, find equal or greater satisfaction for these important organs in other places and at other times. They go to church to worship God. They have no objection to calling the building in which they offer the sacrifice of their praise and obedience and where they commune with God a sanctuary. For them it is a sacred place. What is wrong with that? Is that unbaptistic? Is it unchristian? If the presence of the cross, the Christian symbol, appealing to the eye and to the heart (as worthy organs, surely, as brain and ears) aids them and induces a mood of worship, what rule is there, either of religion or of common sense, to forbid it? It does seem that objection to the presence of the cross may be motivated as was Peter's hesitation when called to minister to the gentiles: "Not so Lord, I never have!" The cross does not belong to Rome.

In the use of eye gate, for both youth and age, the Roman Catholics have put it all over the Baptists, and to their great advantage. Sole dependence upon the logic of language is the tragic weakness of the evangelical churches. In this respect Roger Williams might profitably go to Rome.

Baptists are not distinguished for their fidelity in church attendance. It may be that the satisfaction of head and ears is not what they most crave and does not altogether serve their need. It may be that they go to church to worship God, and that anything which enriches the service, that makes it warm and colorful, that adds to its dignity and its appeal to the emotions

and to the imagination, makes it more attractive and helps to meet their spiritual needs.

Professor Enslin's idea that if a minister should "turn his back on his congregation . . . he becomes a priest" is novel. But is it true? It may be that he thus becomes a fellow worshiper with his congregation. In any case, there is an evangelical sense in which every true minister exercises a priestly function.

It will be gathered from what has been said that the writer disagrees with much in Professor Enslin's article. It is unnecessary to elaborate further. His is a point of view, and he has put it well, and it ought to be stated. There is another point of view which is as wide apart from it as the poles. And that point of view is as fully in accord with basic Baptist principles as is that which he sets forth.

There are those who think of Baptists as a "peculiar people" and that they are better Baptists the more peculiar they are. These are not peculiar people in a biblical sense but merely eccentric, *i.e.*, "out of centre." They make much of the things that nobody believes but Baptists. There are those, on the other hand, who would stress the elements that Baptists share with their fellow Christians. No denomination will ever be saved by its distinctive principles. These have their importance and we must witness to them, but in the degree in which they are distinctive they are not vital. These lie on the periphery, not at the centre. They should be held more loosely, therefore, than those central elements that belong to the common Christian heritage. The injunction, "Come ye out and be ye separate," does not apply to the relations of Christians to one another.

We have endured the incompetencies of our form of congregationalism and our insistence upon the independence and autonomy of the local church in the belief that they were imposed upon us by the authority of the New Testament, and that we had no choice. But now that sound New Testament scholarship has demonstrated that not only congregationalism, but presbyterianism and episcopalianism may claim New Testament sanction, should we not feel free, should we not, indeed, feel a Christian obligation, not to "ape," but in a straightforward fashion to borrow from other denominations whatever elements of church government contribute most to the effectiveness of Christian service?

Baptists, for reasons which it is not easy to determine, find it difficult to coöperate with other Christians. Some Baptists appear to be congenitally indisposed to it. This is strange, since no Baptist principle forbids or restricts it. Multitudes of our brother Christians all over the world believe that they are called to a closer union and a more complete coöperation with Christians of every name. They believe it to be the will of God, and that the times demand it. They believe that the progress toward Christian union

is the most hopeful movement of our day. They pray and labor for it, seeking to understand one another better and to strengthen the bonds that bind them together. There are missionary leaders whose character and intelligence we respect, who are convinced that there is no obstacle to missionary work, particularly in the Far East, comparable to that of our divisions and that after the war that obstacle will grow and not diminish and, if it is not removed, will defeat the missionary cause.

Baptists are moved by these considerations least of all Christians. "We detest the idea of Christian union," said a Southern Baptist at a recent meeting of the Foreign Missions Conference in Cleveland—which must have sounded very shocking to some of those present. Northern Baptists are affiliated with the World Council of Churches. Southern Baptists have declined such affiliation, to the loss both of themselves and of the World Council. The Roman Catholic Church would not send delegates to Lausanne, or later to Edinburgh, to discuss Christian unity, on the ground that they had all the truth without any mixture of error, and that they already knew the answers to all the questions that would be raised there. Let those who want unity come to us, they said; they know the way. That is not an attractive attitude. We should be careful lest we should ever be suspected of being guilty of it. To take that attitude would be indeed for Roger Williams to go to Rome.

When Jesus prayed that his disciples might be one that the world might believe, he may not have been thinking of "organic union," a term of which Baptists are so suspicious, but he was certainly thinking of some sort of visible union, visible enough to serve as a witness to the world. And that we do not have now. What our Lord prayed for, Baptists should work for.

To sum the matter up, in these tragic days we should not put our major emphasis upon the things that make us different from our brother Christians. We must be faithful to our convictions and bear witness, when occasion calls, to our distinctive principles. But we should put our emphasis upon the things that unite us, the treasures that we hold in common with other Christians of every name. Above all, we should remember that if we have something to contribute to the common Christian store we have something also to learn from our brethren, that we have no monopoly of truth. That will keep us humble and coöperative and of use to our Lord.

FOUR FUNDAMENTALISMS

ALBAN G. WIDGERY

Duke University

THOUGH the term fundamentalism is not met so frequently in contemporary American writings on religion as it was formerly, it should not be inferred from this that what it really stood for has disappeared. Though the form of its expression has changed, the essential attitude of fundamentalism still dominates amongst theologians and the leaders of the Christian churches. As mainly used in the past, the term fundamentalism has carried an inuendo just as the name "progressive education" does today. As the latter seems to imply that other forms of educational procedure are not progressive, or not as progressive as progressive education, so fundamentalism suggested that non-fundamentalists neglected attention to fundamentals. This was the more effective in that the latter implication was not entirely erroneous, for it was true at least of some of the modern theological tendencies that they failed to appreciate some fundamentals. Yet, as I would maintain that there are forms of education more truly progressive than progressive education, so I would insist that there are kinds of theological thought giving closer and broader attention to fundamentals than the earlier fundamentalism did. But the term fundamentalism is too expressive to be discarded and it certainly ought not to be left to connote the narrow views associated with it in the past. It should be rehabilitated with a satisfactory significance. The fact is that there are different kinds of fundamentalism which need to be discriminated and denoted by specific qualifying adjectives. It is possible to retain the term while freeing it from its objectionable associations. Nevertheless, for an acceptable fundamentalism we must have a different qualifying adjective to distinguish it from the other types. But before indicating the character of such a fundamentalism, these other types need consideration.

Whatever the other meanings of fundamentalism in the past, it has been most often considered as primarily the view that the Bible is literally the Word of God. This should be called *biblical fundamentalism.* Though widely held in the United States of America, it has not been a merely American product. Indeed, the most definite statement of it of which I am aware is to be found in a sermon preached before an older English university in 1861 by Dr. Burgon. Speaking of the Bible, he said: "Every book of it, every chapter of it, every syllable of it (where shall we stop?), every letter of it, is the direct utterance of the Most High, faultless, unerring, supreme."[1] This position has been largely, if not entirely, abandoned. A considerable number of religious leaders, in pastoral work as in theo-

[1] Quoted by J. E. Carpenter, *Liberal Theology in England* (1910), p. 2.

logical seminaries, have insisted on free scholarly study of the biblical writings. In fact, interest in such biblical fundamentalism is now so little among thinking men that here I shall give only incidental reference to it.

One of the difficulties of the above view of the Bible is that of interpretation. For even if "faultless" itself, it may be wrongly interpreted. Partly with reference to this difficulty, we come to a second kind of fundamentalism, which may be called *ecclesiastical.* This places the chief authority in the church, not just any Christian community, but *the* church, considered as definitely founded by God by specific acts and commands to particular persons. Ecclesiastical fundamentalism is found predominantly among Roman Catholics in their contention that *the* church comes from Jesus through his commission to Peter and in direct succession to him. Some Anglicans who accept the notion of apostolic succession are similarly ecclesiastical fundamentalists. They can say to the biblical fundamentalists that it was the church through its councils which decided on the canon of Holy Scriptures. They can say that the authority to do that was divinely given, and claim that the church by the same authority is the rightful interpreter of the Scriptures. Nevertheless, ecclesiastical fundamentalism is in a difficulty similar to that of biblical fundamentalism. Even if on matters of religion the councils and the popes were infallible, their pronouncements may be misunderstood by their fallible hearers, just as the Scriptures may be misinterpreted by fallible readers.

In the course of many years' association with theologians in Britain and in this country, I have found that the great majority have rejected, not always without scorn, both biblical and ecclesiastical fundamentalism. Nevertheless, not without chagrin on my part, I have come to recognize that with very few exceptions they have still been essentially fundamentalists in a derogatory sense. They have applied modern methods of study to the biblical writings; they have been prepared to admit inconsistencies in them, and to express doubts as to the historical validity and the interpretation of some of their passages. But notwithstanding all that, they have gone on reiterating the traditional Christian creeds and confessions of faith, writing and talking in orthodox terms as though all their studies of the Scriptures and all their investigations of the ecclesiastical development of doctrine made little, if any, difference. They are *creedal fundamentalists.* As such they must be considered as essentially in the same class as biblical and ecclesiastical fundamentalists, for ultimately these latter have most often adopted their views as to the Bible and the church largely as a basis for their continued adherence to the traditional "faith" or creeds. Of course, not a few of these creedal fundamentalists are prepared to ignore or to express doubt about some of the articles of the creeds, as, *e.g.,* the

statements in the Apostles' Creed, "born of the Virgin Mary" and "He descended into hell." The important point is that they still maintain other doctrines, such as that of divine incarnation, themselves incorporated in the creeds on biblical and ecclesiastical bases which are in question. In spite of all their boasted freedom of attitude towards biblical studies and the church, they have remained chained to doctrines of the creeds without providing adequate grounds for so doing apart from the Bible and the authority and tradition of the church.

American examples of creedal fundamentalism abound on all sides: orthodox pronouncements in books, articles, lectures, and sermons, by men regarded by themselves and others as leaders in modern biblical and theological study. As they should be well-known, I give some illustrations from Britain. My examples are outstanding leaders with whom I have had close personal contact, and for whom, apart from their creedal fundamentalism, I have the highest regard both as scholars and as religious men. To the present writer, not officially connected with the ministry of a church or with a theological seminary, this creedal fundamentalism is most distressing. It seems as though its adherents want to pose as on the one hand in the line of religious and intellectual advance, and on the other as loyal to the dogmas of the traditional faith.

Professor J. F. Bethune Baker, for many years editor of the *Journal of Theological Studies,* one of my early teachers and later a colleague, rightly regarded as an independent scholar, was a prominent member of The Modern Churchmen's Union. Notwithstanding his critical studies of the development of Christian doctrine, when he came to state his own position he conformed with traditional language, referring to Jesus as "Incarnate Son of God, very man of very man, very God of very God."[2] For this statement he never gave the grounds that could be regarded as valid in spite of the results of the modern studies of the Bible and the history of Christian doctrine as developed in the church. For some of his views there was once the suggestion of a heresy trial for my friend, Dr. H. D. A. Major, principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford, editor of the *Modern Churchman,* with whom for some years I was a member of the council of The Modern Churchmen's Union. He also expressed himself in traditional language, as follows:

> Jesus Christ must be confessed to be "perfect God" and "perfect man." . . . For Christian orthodoxy, as formulated at Chalcedon, Jesus Christ is both God and man. With that conclusion, the English Modernist has no quarrel: it is the very essence of his faith.[3]

[2] *Modern Churchman* (1925), p. 355.
[3] *Modern Churchman* (1925), p. 157.

One may reasonably doubt whether the explanation, given in his brochure entitled *A Modern View of the Incarnation,*[4] corresponds with what was meant at Chalcedon and generally among the orthodox since then. Even if it does, it may be further asked whether he really provides justification for the language used. I should maintain that he does not. A conception of divine immanence, such as that upon which he relies, might lead to the kind of statement made by Eucken, that Jesus was the highwater mark of a universal movement, but be far short of providing a basis for describing Jesus as "perfect man" and "perfect God." Of course, Dr. Major is at liberty to hold the view he expresses in the words quoted above. What I maintain is that in not indicating adequate grounds for it other than is implied in biblical and ecclesiastical fundamentalism, he is a creedal fundamentalist. As an advanced pupil of Dean W. R. Inge and a student of his writings, I have always had difficulty in deciding what his theological position really is. I have learned much from him, but it has not been in the direction of traditional orthodoxy. With his interest in Platonism and Neoplatonism, it has always seemed to me that for him all historical facts, including the Bible, the church, the creeds, even the historic Jesus, are or contain transient symbols or expressions of the eternal values of the good, the true, and the beautiful—and being temporal are *ipso facto* imperfect. Nevertheless, in his sermons and other utterances, Dr. Inge had so expressed himself that Dr. Hastings Rashdall, with reference to the traditional orthodoxy of St. Paul's Cathedral as contrasted with the liberalism of Westminster Abbey, once said to me: "They are quite glad to have Inge at St. Paul's: they can tolerate me only at the Abbey." Later, Dr. Inge was made Dean of St. Paul's. Whatever may have been the real implication of his views (fairly obvious, for example, to Dr. Rashdall), his language had conformed sufficiently with creedal fundamentalism.

From the foregoing it must not be supposed that I regard fundamentalism in any of these three forms as of little significance. In fact, if I were compelled to make a choice simply between them and the type of view of religion of the theologian, Dr. Wieman, or the mathematical philosopher, Dr. Whitehead, I should be definitely on the side of these fundamentalisms, with the conviction that notwithstanding all that is objectionable in them, they include a more profound appreciation of what is involved in religion. Though I do not consider myself limited to these alternatives, it may be of interest to give the bases for such a decision, for they indicate something of the attitude adopted for arriving at a fourth type of fundamentalism.

Though I judge it wrong in its details, biblical fundamentalism is

[4] Privately printed in 1915. On the last page Dr. Major says that "the essential portions of the positive conclusions" of the General Councils ought to be accepted, but he nowhere explains why. He is evidently falling back on ecclesiastical authority.

based essentially on what I consider to be a genuine fundamental for religion: that God as a conscious Spirit is capable of, and is actually in some manner in, "communication with," "speaking to" men about himself and about themselves. The defect of biblical fundamentalism is in its insistence on a particular way in which this has occurred and its limitation through its view of the Scriptures in the Bible. Ecclesiastical fundamentalism involves what again I regard as a genuine fundamental for religion: that the social organization for human fellowship with religious love (not merely secular aims) and for divine worship is an aspect of a definite purpose of a conscious Spirit, that the church originated in accordance with God's plan and that he is continually present to guide and inspire it, if its members give themselves up to his leadership. The defects of ecclesiastical fundamentalism are its insistence on a particular method of divine operation, as through episcopal ordination in apostolic succession, and the importance it places on ecclesiastical authority with its narrowing effects on thought and practice. Creedal fundamentalism involves the conviction that there are some fundamental beliefs concerning man, the world, and God, the explicit apprehension of which is essential for religion as distinct from a merely emotionally tinged social ethics. The defect of creedal fundamentalism is in the perpetuation of aspects of the traditional orthodox creeds, although it neither shows that they are genuine fundamentals essential for religion nor indicates any adequate grounds for their general acceptance.

In the preceding paragraph I have admitted something from each of the three fundamentalisms, in each of first-rate importance. In view of this it may be urged that I am myself a fundamentalist. I hasten to admit the description, if by it is understood a fourth type of fundamentalism, with its own qualifying adjective. I propose to call it *free fundamentalism.* The term "modernism" applied to some movements of Christian thought in this century, and the description "liberal Christianity" used in the later years of the last century as well as during the past four decades, have been subject to so much abuse and misrepresentation that they are ceasing, if they have not already ceased, to be acceptable among those who will not be tied down by any or all of the three fundamentalisms. They have been abused by their adherents in being associated with specific views of members of particular groups, as the Modernism in the Roman Catholic Church associated with George Tyrrel and Alfred Loisy; or the American modernism of the pseudo-naturalistic sociological type associated with Wieman, Ames, and Haydon; or the liberal Christianity of the German kind emanating from the Ritschlian movement. They have been misrepresented by their opponents in being identified by them solely with such particular views of groups, instead of being understood as modern or liberal attitudes

in general, the adherents of which should not be considered as necessarily belonging to these specific groups.

Some American writers on religion, not a few of whom were previously inclined towards, if not definite followers of, what I have called American modernism, or of some descendant of the Ritschlian liberal Christianity, have awakened to the inadequacies and defects of these positions. But it seems as though they never acquired a deeply rooted modern or liberal attitude. Consequently, not knowing now what positive direction of advance to take, they are scuttling off back to creedal fundamentalism. This would be amusing if it were not so painfully pathetic. They want to retain their self-respect as leaders by making clear that they are not biblical or ecclesiastical fundamentalists. They are obviously uneasy about their positions, as is seen by their different positive and negative responses to Barthianism. One who wishes to avoid the now too common misrepresentations of "modernist" and "liberal" Christianity, and who maintains certain fundamentals involved in the three fundamentalisms, need not fall back into simple creedal fundamentalism. To do so is to abandon the effort for a continually more enlightened and enlightening view of religion. The way that is open in this forward direction is free fundamentalism.

Free fundamentalism is fundamentalism in insisting that man as a thinking and not merely an emotional being must have a religion involving beliefs which are not simply "relativistic" statements, but "fundamentals" including ultimate ideas as the principles for the understanding and the guidance of life. It is "free" because it recognizes no authoritative limitations. It is able to admit God's communication with men in a multiplicity of ways in addition to what it may acknowledge in the Bible. Though it accepts the value of the organizations of the actual churches for the divine purpose of human religious fellowship and divine worship, it is open to see other forms of communal life working to the same end. It is "free" in that it is not restricted by adherence to all or any of the articles of the creeds or confessions of faith on the basis of traditional authority or ecclesiastical requirement, but untrammelled seeks for the truths of religion.

Biblical, ecclesiastical, and creedal fundamentalisms rest on important truths. Their main defects lie in their details involving restrictions leading to some narrowness of religious life and thought. Free fundamentalism acknowledges no such restrictions. Does it then cease to be Christian? In so far as "Christian" is itself taken to imply restrictions, in the sense of a fundamentalism *merely* Christian, the answer to that question must undoubtedly be in the affirmative. Yet free fundamentalism can reasonably be called Christian in that it includes all that can be of religious worth in thought, emotion, and practice in Christianity. However, its attitude towards non-Christian religions is different from that which has prevailed

amongst the adherents of the other fundamentalisms. The latter imply a narrow restriction in reference to other religions, depending on a derogatory view of God's dealings with non-Christians as regards religion. But though free fundamentalism cannot rightly be described as *merely* Christian, the person holding this position would be justified in participating in the religious life of a particular church. He may be a member of a church—as I believe many laymen are today—without definitely adhering to the views of the Bible or the propositions of the confession of faith officially proclaimed by the past (and some present) leaders; and he may accept the form of organization as no more than of practical utility. Indeed, I venture to conclude this paper with my opinion that most of the intelligent laymen with whom I have had contact for the last thirty years have actually had a position such as I have described as free fundamentalism. Biblical, ecclesiastical, and creedal fundamentalists, it appears to me, have been mainly ministers and many (most?) of the teachers in theological seminaries. When I think how little these have emancipated themselves from shackles of the past, I feel for them a deep pessimism. The ordained ministers are the greatest enemies of freedom in religion. Through the exercise of the authority of bishops, conferences, synods, they enslave one another. Some advocates of religion are blaming the scientists for the present troubles of the world. Yet the greatest contributions for modern life have come from the free natural sciences. If their influence has led to a materialistic attitude, it has been mainly because they have so rarely had as a counterpart a free modern view of religion. As a layman I thus place the main blame for these troubles on the leaders of religion, for not presenting such a view and for insisting on obsolete dogmas that repel.

ONCE MORE, THE POOR AUTHOR

MILTON F. WELLS

Production Manager, The Judson Press

As a "victim" of the authorship racket, I read Dr. Bronk's article in the January Crozer Quarterly with interest. I say "victim" advisedly, for in years past I have fallen for a lot of the baloney put forth in writers' magazines by literary agents and schools. I also write "victim" in quotation marks because I question the inferences Dr. Bronk draws, and the implications of his general advice to prospective writers.

Every popular magazine carries advertisements of schools which are just as much rackets as the "writing academies." There are the civil service schools, the hotel-management colleges, the diesel-engine and electrical engineering schools. You can become a draftsman, a cartoonist, an accountant, an executive in any business, if you will only take sixteen or thirty-six lessons via your postman. "Be a Radio Technician. Learn at Home. Many make $30, $40, $50 a week," says an ad in a magazine several months old. (I suppose it is $75, $100, $125 in current ads.) "Where Do You Go from Here?" asks a correspondence institution which issues textbooks covered with pictures of distinguished looking executives. "Draw Me. Try for an Art Scholarship," challenges another ad; "perhaps you'll win a complete art instruction course free!" There's no "perhaps" about it—you won't!

Few will deny that these schools are "racket academies." And they do lure students with promises of easy and lucrative achievement. But are our foremost colleges and universities entirely free from the taint of racketeering? Naturally, the better established the school, the more dignified the appeal. Almost any university in the country will take your money for nearly any kind of an "extension" course without your possessing any vital qualifications beyond the ability to study and to read the English language.

In 1932 I wrote to the extension department of one of America's largest universities, which advertised extensively in all the prominent magazines. I had sold my first literary effort—a short story—to a Sunday-school paper some years before. Since then, I had received enough rejection slips to paper a good-sized room. I realized that something was wrong, and decided—like Dr. Bronk's "John"—to do something about it.

I was visited by a representative of the university, who examined my printed effort and immediately advised me to take the course in short story. I protested that I wanted to write articles, but he convinced me that the money was to be made in short stories—and went away with my

signature on the dotted line. After two semesters of effort and the expenditure of ninety dollars, I received a certificate of successful completion. I can tell you now that I should have been flunked in disgrace and discouraged from ever again writing a short story. I still have the papers to prove it. Nevertheless, the course was of value to me, because it proved to my own satisfaction that I could not write fiction. I know that the course is a good one, because it teaches a lot of valuable things about fiction. It should help to make good writers when taken by the right people. The trouble, it seems to me, lies with the "placement expert," who was mainly interested in the commission on a higher-priced course.

Success in writing depends on all the factors that govern success in any other craft. First, a long apprenticeship. A person in any occupation, who remembers his apprenticeship, is bound to be discouraging. Do I want my son to be a printer—or a writer? You can bet your life that I don't. The engineering field seems more promising to me—at least right now—even though a few years ago graduates of reputable institutes of technology were holding down jobs as crossing-gate watchmen or "soda-jerkers." No doubt the professional engineer will hold up his hands in horror at the thought of his son going into the engineering field. He will probably suggest writing as a career!

A teacher of any subject can impart to the student only what he knows about the matter in hand. And the intelligent teacher knows that practice—constant, persevering, unstinted practice—is the key to success in any endeavor. So why discourage Dr. Bronk's "John" from his literary efforts? If he serves a long enough apprenticeship—which consists of writing, writing, writing, a bit of advice from the teacher, and then more writing—he'll get somewhere if he has what it takes. If he hasn't—well, he'll give up after awhile and devote the time to the job he can do best. If he's interested only in money, he'll learn soon enough that he can earn more dollars digging ditches or selling Fuller brushes!

As for the popular magazines of America, the less said the better. Most of the fiction were better not printed. The articles are by big-name writers who sometimes say something and more often do not. Of course, what they say must not disturb the *status quo*. By the time a writer becomes "big name" he has well learned that lesson. He also learns that once he sells to a magazine he can repeat *ad infinitum*. He knows that once he gets a following, he can print the most utter tripe with impunity.

In the field of book publishing, Dr. Bronk speaks with authority. Truly, of the making of many books there is no end. And the situation is not helped by people who print books at their own expense. If they cannot afford it, I have little sympathy for them; at least, no more than for the person who splurges on fur coats or automobiles which he or she cannot

afford. Or, as in my case, on a library which is eating me out of house and home. Truly, we have *our* reward!

Now, what is the upshot of this whole matter? My contention is that if people want to write, let them write. Surely, they should be protected from victimization, as should aspirants in every field. If the proper agencies of government were doing their jobs—which they won't be for the duration, at least—half of these exploiters would be legislated out of business. However, the world needs writers, and by that I mean people who have something to say and the courage to say it. If a man is really a writer, he'll say his say and get it printed somewhere, somehow. The best books published are not the best sellers. You'll find them on the remainder tables, in the secondhand and out-of-print shops. Who will read *The Sheik,* or *Gone with the Wind,* or *Out of the Night* ten years from now? Not I, for one—either now or then.

Yes, you guessed it, I *am* writing a book. If I can get a thousand people to read it after it's printed, I'll be very happy. A thousand people will be encouraged to do something about war—the plague of mankind. Maybe ten of them will really do something about it. And maybe one lone person of that ten will be in a position someday—like Abraham Lincoln with the slavery problem—to "hit that thing hard." That, to me, would justify all the sweat and tears and money I have thrown into the authorship racket. Like Tiny Tim, I could then say, "God bless them, every one!"

There are racketeers in every field, and success does not always come to him who deserves it. In this world of nearsighted people, the old capitalize on their so-called experience and the young chafe at the bit and waste their energy behind some "stuffed shirt" who never did know what it was all about. The system creates sluggards in turn. By the time the youth gets into a position of responsibility and power he is old and tired.

That is why we need more and more writers—young, alive, vibrant with courage and hope, ideas and ideals. We need them to break down with a flood of words the dikes of ignorance and superstition and privilege. If there are enough of them, they will create their own journals, and put new courage and spirit into the hundreds of noncommercial "opinion" magazines which exist today. Thus they can create a new Renaissance in the stupid journalistic world of today.

The commercial magazine with a tremendous circulation rolls along with a sluggish momentum. It pours into the minds of millions ready-made opinions, saccharine fiction prattling of motorcars, dinner gowns, cocktail bars, millionaires, and debutantes. To fall into a fortune in the fiction world of America is as easy as falling off a log. Stenographers marry their rich employers as a matter of course. During wartime the stories are

the same, except that both man and maid are in uniform, ready to dash off to the defense of the nation.

The average magazine may be fascinating in the beginning, but after awhile one's mind becomes saturated with the owner's sense of well-being; his general satisfaction with the Thing he built up from a paste pot; with a sickening gooey mess of writing-that-says-nothing-after-all. All this—and heaven, too—but nary an exposé of even the authorship racket!

The presses roll on, meeting publication dates, making work for the printers—thank the Lord!—and printing a monotonous drivel of words until I often wonder that God himself, weary to death of such persiflage, does not wipe out the mess with one fell swoop. But subscriptions have been paid, circulation must be increased beyond the break-even point, and something must be printed to give the customer his pennyworth.

Someday I'd like to subscribe to a periodical that comes out once in awhile—when the editor has found articles and stories that really have something to say. Perhaps even he, after awhile, would say, "Well, we haven't put out a paper for awhile. I suppose we ought to get one out. Let's see, what shall we put in it?"

No, my advice to the budding young author is not Henri Murger's, Dr. Bronk's, or even his "editor's." My advice to the young author is: "Write—if you must. But write, write, write until you are sick to the soul of writing. Write what you think, not what you think you ought to think, or what you think it pays you to think. To hell with the money. Never mind *Wake Up and Live, How to Make Friends and Influence People, How to Be Successful,* etc. Leave financial success to the poor old captains of industry, with their golf balls and souvenir dimes. Live—and write—and live some more—and write—send it away—get it back—and write, write, write, write, write——"

JOHN AMOS COMENIUS

ANDREW PAUL SLABEY

Duquesne, Pennsylvania

THIS YEAR[1] marks the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the birth of the great educator and bishop, John Amos Comenius. Churches and educational institutions in America and Great Britain are commemorating this revered figure of Evangelical Christendom. It is appropriate to review briefly his tragic but fruitful life.

John Amos Comenius was born on March 28, 1592, in a romantic little town of Nivnitz (Nivnice) in Moravian Slovakia, where his father was a successful miller and a respected member of the famous Unity of Bohemian Brethren Church or the *Unitas Fratrum* from which the Moravian Church is descended. The father's name was Martin, the mother's Anna. Family names were not yet established back in those days. Since Martin originally came from the town of Komma, the people at Nivnitz called him Komensky, the name by which his son is generally known to his Czechoslovakian countrymen. Two girls, Ludmila and Susanna, also graced the happy family. It was not easy to be a Protestant in that age and country, but the family found comfort and strength in the daily family altar when the father would read a portion from the newly published Kralicka Bible while the water churned and turned the wheels of the flour mill.

In order to be closer to a strong church of their faith the family moved to Uhersky Brod, not far from Slovakia proper, where Martin Komensky was an active member and a friend of the pastor. Martin died in 1604, and was followed within a year by his wife and the two girls. Thus John Amos Komensky became an orphan at the age of twelve. He inherited some property, but the guardians cared little for the boy. Later his aunt took him into her home at Strazhnitze, a seven hours' walk from Uhersky Brod, where he attended the Brethren school.

Due to the crude and painful system of education in those days, young Komensky soon quit school and began to learn a trade, but at the age of sixteen he took a liking to the study of Latin and decided to enter the Brethren Latin school at Prerov, where he prepared for college in three years.

By this time Komensky was a handsome young man of sterling character. Since he showed an aptitude for church work, the elders of the Bohemian Brethren Unity decided to send him to college to prepare either for teaching or the ministry. To what college should he go? There was a Czechoslovakian university in Prague, founded in 1348, the oldest

[1] *I. e.*, 1942.

in Central Europe. That this famous university was then in the hands of another Protestant group would have been of no moment had it only been more strict in discipline. Again they might have sent him to Leipzig, but that university was then strictly Lutheran, while the Unity of Brethren favored the Swiss reformers or the Presbyterians. Thus they decided to send him to the Reformed College at Herborn in the distant Duchy of Nassau, where he went as companion to the young Lord of Kunovitz.

Comenius enrolled at Herborn College in 1611 and spent there two busy and pleasant years. He found more than he expected. The college had a high standard of scholarship as well as of discipline; in addition it had a good library. He drank at the fountain of learning with satisfaction, and sat at the feet of the godly Professor J. H. Alsted who taught him not only to know but also to love the Bible, which became his favorite study throughout life. And he studied also courses in arts and science with good results. He made many friends. Nothing important escaped his attention, but he kept away from unworthy attractions. As a student he conceived the idea of writing a comprehensive Latin-Czech dictionary, and began to collect words, phrases, idioms, and proverbs for the book. Languages interested him, and he became a noted linguist. In later years he wrote nearly 150 books and tracts, most of which were in his native Czechoslovakian, with some in Latin and a few in German. He kept his eyes open for improved methods of teaching, and was happy when he came upon a book on the subject of pedagogy by Wolfgang Ratich, a schoolmaster of Holstein.

After two years of fruitful study at Herborn he enrolled for a year of advanced work in 1613 at another Calvinistic school, the University of Heidelberg. Here he matriculated as John Amos of Nivnitz, but later he adopted his father's name, Komensky, which was Latinized into Comenius according to a custom of the learned in the seventeenth century. The splendid Heidelberg library appealed to him, and he spent many an hour making himself familiar with its precious contents. This enabled him to select with care books for his own library. He must have paid a good price for a famous manuscript by another Slav, the Polish Kopernik or Copernicus, on astronomy, which Comenius was studying along with mathematics and other subjects at Heidelberg.

At the close of the school year Comenius completed his education by travel through numerous German states to Amsterdam, Holland. That country had special interest for him because it had been recently freed from the Spanish Catholic yoke and had become an asylum of Protestantism. He was impressed with its good government, its churches, schools, farms, shops, and factories. Perhaps he even went to see the Pilgrim settlers at Leyden. When he returned for his baggage at Heidelberg, he fell ill,

for he had been traveling on foot most of the way. Upon recovery he walked again to Prague, the capital of Bohemia, where he stopped to make himself acquainted with this ancient city which had played such an important role in European history. From Prague he proceeded to Prerov, in his native Moravia, arriving in 1614.

No sooner had Comenius returned to Prerov than the powerful nobleman, Lord Charles, Sr., of Zherotin, who was a respected member of the Brethren Unity, engaged him as instructor at the Latin school which he had attended. Comenius was then only twenty-two years old, too young to be ordained to the ministry. He undertook the work of teaching in the religious school with zeal and joy in this town of about 4,000 inhabitants, almost all of whom were members of the Unity.

This Unity, or denomination of the Czech or Moravian Brethren, was founded in Bohemia in 1457 as an outgrowth of the work of John Hus, the martyred reformer who had been condemned by the Roman Church and burnt alive in 1415. At its inception the Unity was not enthusiastic for higher education, but in the sixteenth century the great Bishop John Blahoslav advocated higher learning for the professions and a good elementary education for the laity. At any rate, the Brethren were required to be able to read the Bible and the hymnbook. Their method of teaching, however, may not have been better than that of other schools of that period. Comenius wrote new textbooks, introduced better methods of instruction, and soon became the headmaster.

Prerov was at that time the seat of the president bishop, John Lanetius. Young Comenius was fortunate to find quarters in the exemplary home of this good bishop who took a fatherly interest in him. Brother John Amos, as he was usually called, made himself useful around the house, helped the children with their lessons, and assisted the bishop in his office and church work. He also found time to explore Moravia and to draw the best map of that province, which he presented to his patron, Lord Zherotin. His friendly interest in people and a winning smile won him many friends. Somewhere he says that the highest good of life is a calm and happy disposition. His preaching talent was soon discovered, and, after two years of successful teaching, in 1616, he was ordained to the ministry. The Brethren called their clergymen ministers, priests, seniors or elders, and bishops. They claimed apostolic succession and were recognized by the Church of England, although in doctrine they leaned more towards Calvinism. Of this pre-Reformation Protestant church Luther wrote: "Since the days of the Apostles there has existed no church which in her doctrine and rites has more clearly approximated to the spirit of that age than the Bohemian Brethren."

Comenius loved the church as well as the school, and for two years

continued to serve both, until 1618, when he was called to the pastorate of a flourishing parish in a quaint old town called Fulnek near the borders of northern Moravia. This parish with its adjacent villages needed a man who could preach in two languages—Bohemian or Czech and German. Komensky-Comenius was the man. He lived here in a large two-storied stone house, on the slope of a hill overlooking the town, and served efficiently as pastor and school principal. Not only his own parishioners but also outsiders, including Catholics, came to know and to love him as their friend. Besides preaching, teaching, and writing he tried to improve the social condition of his community. One of his projects was the importation of honey bees from Slovakland. It is believed that he found in that sister country his first wife, a Slovak lady of the gentry class. This was a happy marriage. In a letter Komensky addresses her: "My darling wife, my dearest jewel after God." He calls the two or three years spent in Fulnek the happiest of his life. He got along well with both Czechs and Germans because they were Christians.

Alas, clouds were gathering over the blue skies, and soon a great storm thundered over the country.

About ninety per cent of the Bohemians were Protestants, but they were ruled by the ultra-Catholic Austrian-German dynasty of the Hapsburgs. The Protestant Bohemians or Czechs had fought for religious liberty against their German Catholic Hapsburg kings for a hundred years and had succeeded in compelling King Rudolph II in 1609 to grant them a *letter of majesty,* which guaranteed religious liberty to Protestants of all denominations. But the crafty Jesuit party subverted by intrigues even this bit of liberty, and drove the Bohemian nobility into an unpremeditated revolution in 1618, which marked the beginning of the Thirty Years War.

King Ferdinand II, supported by the Jesuits, the pope, and other Catholic allies, succeeded in defeating the Czechoslovak Protestants at the battle of White Mountain near Prague on November 8, 1620. The victor declared that he would rather have the Bohemian kingdom desolate than heretic, and he kept his word. The unfortunate nation was mercilessly ravaged. The tyrant king gave orders for the execution of the leaders of the rebellion, and on June 21, 1621, no less than twenty-seven Czech and Slovak nobles were publicly beheaded in Prague. He also gave orders to confiscate the property of the heretics. All who would not return to the Roman Catholic Church were banished from their fatherland. The number of such families is estimated at 36,000. Many more perished in the turbulence of devastating war, only 800,000 remaining of a nation of three million.

Although Comenius took no part in the revolution, the calamity fell upon him very heavily. In 1621 the town of Fulnek was burnt and

plundered by the Spanish mercenaries of the Hapsburg Ferdinand II. Comenius was forced to flee for his life and lost not only his property, among which were his valuable library and priceless manuscripts, but also his dear wife and two small children who died of pestilence in his absence. He writes that he was on the brink of despair at this time, could not sleep for nights, but one dark night as he tossed about in his bed in the wee hours he jumped out of the bed, reached for his Bible, and found comfort in the book and in fervent prayer. The storm in his soul became calm.

From 1621 to 1627 Comenius remained in hiding with some Brotherhood nobles, especially the Lord of Zherotin who was in favor with the king because he had taken no part in the rebellion. His hiding places before the Jesuit hounds were often the woods, the caves, and the cabins in the mountains on the borderland. It was in a hidden cabin that he wrote his famous allegory, *The Labyrinth of the World,* and dedicated it to his lord protector in 1623. Now he also wrote his famous *Didactic.* In 1624 he married Dorothy, the daughter of Bishop John Cyril.

During this dangerous period the Brethren pastors secretly ministered to the faithful, among whom was Comenius, wherever and whenever possible, at peril of their lives. But when strict orders came from the king in 1627 that all Protestant ministers must leave Bohemia and Moravia under penalty of death, Comenius was sent with two other men to look about for a place to emigrate. They found refuge in Lissa or Leshno, Poland, on a feudal estate of a kind Polish nobleman, Count Leshchinski, who had previously allowed the Brethren to settle and had become a convert to their faith. So in a bitter winter of February, 1628, the faithful group of the Brethren gathered at a certain spot to go into exile. As they approached the border of Bohemia, they stopped on a hill to take a last look at their beloved country; kneeling on the cold snow and led by Comenius they prayed with tears for the fatherland, beseeching the Lord to preserve "a hidden seed" of pure gospel faith in it, and to be merciful to the people.

After ten days of hard winter travel they reached Leshno in Poland, where they were gladly received by their Brethren. The town had about 1,600 houses at that time, with two Protestant churches. Comenius was given charge of the high school or *gymnasium.* In 1632, by vote of all ministers at a synod, he was consecrated as bishop. In addition he was made the scribe, or executive secretary, of the Unity of Brethren. His many duties included keeping the records, writing the history of his church, keeping in touch with the students and providing for them where necessary, correspondence, and the refutation of attacks upon the Brethren. This last he did very tactfully. He republished the *Confession of the Unity* of 1535 and wrote an excellent *Ratio Disciplinæ* (order of discipline)

which was copied more or less by other churches. For example, the Congregational rules of order by Increase Mather in 1700, to mention but one, were borrowed from the great Moravian. It is said that Count Zinzendorf was able to reconstruct from these two books the Moravian Brethren Church on his estate at Herrnhut in 1722. A book of discipline and a confession of faith may have their advantages. The Brethren allowed much freedom of faith, but Comenius insisted on good discipline. He also wrote an excellent book, *Practice of Piety,* and many other devotional books.

But the first book to make him famous all over the world was his epochal *Janua Linguarum Reserata,* which he published in 1629. This book was quickly translated into many European languages, and also into Turkish, Arabic, Persian, and Mongolian. It simplified the study of languages immensely. He received such an avalanche of compliments upon this book that he was surprised. Two other books on education which enhanced his fame in this period were his well-known *Didactic* and *The Mother-School:* the one contributed much to the art of teaching, the other laid foundations for our public school system. Comenius advocated education for everybody, rich and poor together, for boys and girls alike. His aim was Christian character, decidedly religious. There is much to learn from him in religious education. It was he who wrote the first illustrated schoolbook, the *Orbis Sensualium Pictus,* the crude pictures of which he sketched himself. He made the learning process easier. Students loved to study under him, and his disciples were in demand as teachers. And it was he who first divided the day into eight hours of work, eight of recreation, and eight for sleep. Not forgetting the preacher, he wrote in Czechoslovak an ideal textbook, *The Art of Preaching,* which though copied by his students remained in manuscript for 172 years until in 1823 it was put into print by a liberal Catholic priest. But his greatest ambition was to write a series of books on "Pansophy," a sort of encyclopædia. Due to misfortune he was unable to complete this work.

Through the influence of his friend in London, Samuel Hartlib, who was interested in his writings and corresponded with him, Comenius was invited by the British Parliament to lay before that body his educational reforms. Two or three of his books had already been published and circulated in England, namely his *Janua Linguarum,* the great *Didactic,* and the *Prodromus Pansophicus* (Essay towards Complete Wisdom). Hartlib, who was a friend of Milton, seems to have represented a group of Parliament members including Lord Brooke, Pym, Selden, Viscount Mandeville, the Earl of Warwick, Bishop Williams, and Archbishop Ussher.

After a perilous voyage Comenius came to London in September,

1641, and was cordially welcomed by Hartlib and other representative Englishmen. He remained through the winter holding conferences with prominent people, writing a book, the *Way of Light,* and making plans for the establishment of a "College of Light" near London for the purpose of spreading true knowledge, universal peace, and brotherhood among the nations. Because of the Irish rebellion, this lofty ideal never matured, and the Parliament was postponed.

Under these unfavorable circumstances Comenius ended his ten months' stay in England and boarded a boat for Holland to call on some friends and to interview the Catholic philosopher Descartes at Leyden. Here he received an invitation from Cardinal Richelieu to come to France as an educator, perhaps also one from New England to become president of Harvard College, but he preferred to go to Sweden, whither he had been called by a wealthy Protestant patron, Louis de Geer, who introduced him to Axel Oxenstjerna, the powerful chancellor of King Gustav Adolf of Sweden and Queen Christina; he also met Archbishop Skyte and others.

Comenius was engaged to write better schoolbooks for Sweden, while his English friends urged him to work on his *Pansophy,* which would be far more important. Comenius was a humble and tolerant Christian. The chancellor advised him to make his home in the city of Elbing in Prussia, which would be easily approachable both from Sweden and from Leshno and where, above all, the Protestants were tolerant and friendly. They really gave Comenius a brotherly welcome and made his six years of stay with them pleasant.

Meanwhile the Thirty Years' War was still going on. Sweden was at that time a strong Protestant power. Comenius and the Bohemian Protestant refugees or exiles longed and hoped and prayed for the victory of religious liberty which would allow them to return to their beloved country. Before leaving for Elbing, Comenius pleaded tenderly with the powerful Chancellor Oxenstjerna not to forget his Protestant brethren of Bohemia and Moravia but to make a provision, when the treaty of peace should be made, to enable them to return home and worship God according to the dictates of their conscience. The chancellor promised, but his promise was not carried out, for when the Peace of Westphalia was concluded in October, 1648, Comenius and his people were forgotten, and their country remained in the clutches of the bigoted Ferdinand III. Comenius' heart was almost crushed, and the Church of the Brethren lamented with him.

In that year Comenius returned to Leshno with his sick wife. She soon died, leaving him a son and four young daughters. The seat of the presiding bishop became vacant, and the Unity bestowed that honor upon Comenius in 1648, when he was fifty-six years old. To enable others to have more he never drew any salary as bishop.

Having given up hope—at least for the time—of ever returning to his native country, Bishop Comenius wrote a tender farewell address to his distressed and diminishing flock, under the title, *The Bequest of the Unity of Brethren* in 1650. This booklet and the *Labyrinth* have been recently translated anew into English by Professor Matthew Spinka. They are among the classical gems of literature.

Invitations kept coming to him from various parts. These he invariably declined, except the one from a powerful Duke or Prince Rákóczy of Transylvania, who ruled also over the greater part of Slovakia, to come and reform the college at Sharish Potok. This duke was of Slovak descent and a Calvinist who had given refuge upon his large estates to many Bohemian Brethren. It was chiefly out of gratitude that Comenius accepted this call; still there was also the hope that this powerful rival of the Hapsburg king would someday liberate the Czechs.

On Easter, 1650, Comenius arrived with his faithful son-in-law, the Reverend Peter Figulus, in the town of Skalitsa in Slovakia, where he preached a wonderful sermon to a happy congregation of refugees who listened with moistened eyes to the words of their good bishop. That week he presided over a synod and told them of his efforts for religious liberty for Bohemia: The German and Swedish Protestant brethren had failed to gain such provision in the peace treaty, but God was still with them. They should be of good cheer. From a hilltop at this town he saw—for the first time in thirty years and the last in his life—his native town across the boundary in Moravia. He dared not cross over into Moravia under penalty of death, but he leaned over the line and picked himself a daisy. The following week he proceeded to another synod in Puchow, Slovakia, where twenty ministers attended besides many laymen. Here they read the newly published *History* of their church by a Polish author, Lasitski. Then he continued eastward to Sharish Potok, where he was gladly received by the Rákóczys and many other Hungarian noblemen. Here he remained four years as rector of the Reformed College, introducing his ideas and methods.

When Comenius returned to Leshno, or Lissa, in 1654 for the third time, he found that things had become worse. Count Leschinski, the protector of the Brethren, had died, and his son was compelled to give up the Protestant faith and become a Catholic. He wished to remain a friend of the Brethren, but his bishop interfered. Meanwhile war broke out between the Catholic Poles and the Protestant Swedes. Unfortunately the Poles burnt Leshno in 1656, and in that fire perished many of Comenius' priceless manuscripts, namely, his *Pansophy,* his *Dictionary* of Latin-Czech on which he had labored forty-six years since Herborn days, a *Bible Concordance,* and forty years of sermons which he had intended to

leave to his son who also was a minister. The author bewailed this loss to his dying day.

Comenius fled to a friend in Silesia, then to Hamburg, where he became ill. Just when he needed help the most, the Lord provided for him through a friend, Lawrence de Geer, the son of his former patron, who invited him to Amsterdam to spend his remaining years in peace. He was now sixty-four years old, but he was still remarkably active. Publishers vied for his books and printed them in handsome editions. He translated his important works into Latin. The city of Amsterdam honored him; the Dutch were kind to him. Still he cared for his scattered flock like a good shepherd. He obtained gifts of money from the Swiss, the Dutch, and the English Christians and divided it among the poor refugees of his church. Not forgetting spiritual food, he published for them in Czecho-slovak a "Shorter Bible," a hymnbook, and other religious books. These books were *verboten*—not allowed in Bohemia under heavy penalty—but somehow they got in, and kept the gospel light burning secretly, so that 110 years after his death, when the Edict of Toleration was granted by Joseph II, about 150,000 Czechs left the Roman Church and returned to Protestantism.

In 1666 he wrote a remarkable book, *Advice about Repairing Human Affairs,* in which he pled for universal peace and brotherhood among the nations: "Come, let us all covenant together that we shall do the will of God for the salvation of all humanity. . . . Let us put away things that divide us. . . . For we are all citizens of one world, we are all one blood, we are all people, and therefore imperfect, needy of help, and debtors of one another." He strove also for church unity and was interested in missions. He believed in prophecy, in Christ's second coming, and in eternal life. As a man of Christlike character he was friendly with people; he never paid evil for evil but was conciliatory and humble. He was ready to serve others and sacrifice himself. He never condemned, was loyal to his friends, and prayed for his enemies. In joy or sorrow he praised the Lord.

His forty-two years of exile were ended on November 15, 1670, when he died peacefully in Amsterdam and was buried at Naarden, Holland. His spirit still lives on.

Where Ignorance Is Bliss, 'Tis Folly

It is scarcely too much to say that by the trifling change of one letter—from ŏ to ō—a complete transformation of Paul's greatest contribution to Christian thought results. And not only that, the modern translations, following the so-called "critical texts," in this particular case are the ones which lead us astray. Thus Goodspeed, Moffatt, the Twentieth Century, Weymouth, Mrs. Montgomery—all attempting to translate Westcott-Hort or Nestle—preserve what I am convinced is the inferior reading. The King James and the American Revised Version (which latter in this particular reading reproduces the King James, although it allows the rival reading to appear in the margin with the annotation, "Many ancient authorities read . . .") follow the usually far less trustworthy *Textus Receptus* and preserve the intrinsically superior reading. And the curious thing is that textual critics are probably justified in feeling that the erroneous reading is the better attested and not impossibly the earlier. It is far from impossible that it is what Tertius actually wrote, thinking it was what Paul had said. Yet it is almost equally certain that it was not what Paul meant as he dictated the letter. The probability is that the two words were pronounced alike in Paul's day; we know that they were at a somewhat later date.

Such a verse is certainly worth our attention. It is Romans 5:1—"Being therefore justified by faith, *we have* peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ"; not as the rival reading suggests ". . . *let us have*" nor even ". . . *let us continue to have*" or ". . . *let us continue to enjoy.*"

To appreciate this emphasis—a revolutionary emphasis then, and no less important today—it is necessary to see the word in its context (always a wise prelude to sober exegesis). Romans is markedly different from the other Pauline letters: it was not written to a church which he had established and for which, in consequence, he felt any especial responsibility. He was planning to pass through Rome on his hoped for visit to the Roman west. It would be an advantage if the Roman Christians had an unbiased statement of what his views really were. This would effectively undercut suspicion as to why he was coming and as to the kind of man he really was. Probably he had had occasion some time before to write such a *confessio fidei*—the considered statement of his matured views without the overemphasis so natural and understandable in a heated letter of debate like Galatians. Now he had a copy of it made with a bit of new material added especially for the Romans.

After his salutation, greeting, and thanksgiving he had declared his obligation to God to preach the gospel and, in keeping with this, his desire

to preach it to them in Rome. Then comes his ringing definition of the gospel—it serves as the thesis of the whole letter: all the rest is but an orderly expansion of these tremendous words—

> For I am not ashamed of the gospel: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew, and also to the Greek. For therein is revealed a righteousness of God from faith to faith: as it stands written, But the righteous shall live by faith.

This righteousness is not something imparted (or imputed). No man is made to *merit* salvation; still less is he so regarded by God on the basis of questionable bookkeeping or the juggling of credits. Rather, through certain great redemptive acts God has made it possible for him to enter into a right relationship with him [God], that at the final assize he may stand acquitted. All this has been made possible through union with Christ—the words "in Christ" are the heart and centre of the Pauline gospel. In a word, his faith in Christ is a new life which he has apprehended. How slow the church has always been to realize this all-important fact: faith is life! How much later shadowboxing between the comparative merits of faith and works could have been avoided had this tremendous—and yet so simple and obvious—fact been recognized.

Then he quickly develops this thesis: All men stand under God's wrath, and rightly, because of their disobedience. This applies to Jew and gentile alike. The gentile did not have the Law to guide him—better said, to warn him. Nonetheless he was without excuse. The unwritten law, the capacity to discern the essential obligations of the moral law, was as surely engraved on his conscience as was for the Jew the Mosaic law on the tables of stone. But though all have failed, God has made redemption possible through the death of his Son, through union with whom all may be acquitted. The one condition is faith, that is, this newness of life, the amazing possession of the newborn Christ-man. But it is the *sine qua non.* The old-fashioned gospel song, "There's no other Way but his Way," exactly catches this note. This view does not do away with the law. It establishes it. It was by faith, not by the rite of circumcision, that Abraham was justified. The later rite was given as a visible seal of a covenant already made.

Then comes the climactic and triumphant word: Being therefore justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, in union with whom we have had and now possess free access to this grace wherein now we stand. That is—and it is the vital point so completely neglected by many modern translators—the Christian's own experience of new peace, with the age-long antagonism and warring in his conscience now at an end, reveals and attests the truth of his confidence. How utterly

this excludes the false note, "Let us have peace." It is not a second step still necessary, as if he were saying: We have been accepted by God; hence let us push on to peace with him. Nothing like that for Paul! We already have this peace; the fact that we do have it, that we do love the things that God loves, that we are no longer rebelliously kicking against the goads of life—this *proves* to us that we are in right relation with him.

My soul what a word! How sorely we need to hear it, and believe it, today. It is basic to everything else: If we are at peace with God—and let that word be interpreted as broadly as one will—it is the *prima-facie* proof that we are in our right relation with him. How simple it is; yet what a time we have to see it! We engage in our endless and profitless debate: "Is God a god of love?" "Is the universe friendly?" And for each seemingly affirmative indication our neighbor points out a disquieting negative. And acrimony and unrest result. Could we but get this fundamental note in mind, we would instead raise a question that means something: "Are we friendly to God? to the universe?" Do we find ourselves in harmony with the immutable laws of life as we meet them on every hand, or do we accept the law of gravity in the physical universe but deny it in the moral universe? In a word, do we accept, not with the sense of rebellious or listless necessity but wholeheartedly and with ungrudging joy, the things that God so obviously loves? If we do, need we fret as we wonder whether we have achieved a right relation with him? Does not our sense of being "where we belong" bring its own self-satisfying answer?

From Off the Campus and On

RECENT issues of the CROZER QUARTERLY have carried pointed discussions of that much discussed figure, the Protestant minister. This quarter's leader is a worthy companion piece to round out the trilogy. It is safe to say that it will be widely read by both pulpit and pew. It says some things that needed sorely to be said, and, with apologies to the *Book of Common Prayer,* it says them "in a tongue understanded of the people." To refer to but one of them: The crisp paragraph which begins, "We must stop recruiting for the ministry," might well be set in boldface. Like a fishhook, it slips in easily; it is not so easy to pull it out. Few men are more ideally fitted to sound this challenge than is Dr. Mackie. Following his graduation from Princeton—both the University and the Theological Seminary—and a short pastorate in Philadelphia, he was minister of the Tully Memorial Church, Sharon Hill, Pa., for twenty-five years. In 1936 he became president of the Presbyterian Minister's Fund. Since 1922 he has been chairman of the Home Mission Committee of the Chester Presbytery. In addition to his duties as president of two large insurance companies he is associate minister (in charge) of the Collenbrook Church at Drexel Hill.

No name stands higher in the scale of biblical scholarship than does that of James A. Montgomery. For more than thirty years he was a member of the graduate faculty of the University of Pennsylvania, internationally known as a Semitist and philologian. For thirty-six years he was also professor of Old Testament at the Philadelphia Divinity School. Among his many books, which range from *The Samaritans* (1909) to *Hebrew Mythological Texts from Ras Shamra* (1935), may be mentioned his volume on Daniel in the *International Critical Commentary.* At this time when all eyes are focused on the Mediterranean and the Near East an essay dealing with these very lands by this prince of scholars will be read with increased interest.

A recent number of the CROZER QUARTERLY (October, 1942) carried a review of a volume by Dean Lund. So important did his thesis appear that the editor invited him to prepare an article on the same theme, but in less technical treatment, for these pages. "The Significance of Chiasmus for Interpretation" was his generous response. Dr. Lund was born in Sweden. As a boy he came to America for his education. Following his graduation from North Park College and Theological Seminary in 1910, he continued his studies at Bethany College, Andover Theological Seminary, Harvard, and the University of Chicago. In each of these several schools he collected degrees ranging from an A.B. at the first to a Ph.D. at the last. In 1922 he joined the faculty of the North Park Theological Seminary and has been dean since 1925.

Dr. Ashworth's essay is so self-explanatory that it would seem to require no introduction. Any who may in the past have been guilty of the folly of ascribing heterodoxy to the editor will find therein a full proof of

his innocence. Dr. Ashworth, a native of Scotland, holds degrees from Columbia, Union Theological Seminary, and Brown. For many years he was in the parish ministry, his last charge being the Church of the Redeemer, Yonkers, N. Y. Since 1933 he has been editorial secretary of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. A volume, *The Union of Christian Forces in America* (1915), won him the $1000 prize from the American Sunday School Union. He is lecturer on Baptist principles and polity at Union Theological Seminary.

Professor Widgery has been frequently introduced in these pages. Our readers will remember his spirited retort, "Further Comments on Christian Ethics" (January, 1942). An Englishman by birth, he holds degrees from Cambridge, did graduate work on the Continent, and was for six years professor of philosophy at the University of Bombay. Since 1930 he has been head of the department of philosophy at Duke University. His interesting subdivision of what is known as "fundamentalism" shows that values may be found in the most unexpected places.

It is a particular pleasure to welcome Milton F. Wells, production manager of The American Baptist Publication Society, to our pages. Not only is he expert in the gentle art of immortalizing (or embalming) other peoples' ideas through the medium of the printed page, but he is a constant (and accepted) contributor himself to religious and trade journals. He is thus capitally fitted to add a postscript to the article of his former associate, Dr. Bronk, which appeared in our last issue.

Andrew P. Slabey was born in Czechoslovakia. He came to America as a boy and eventually graduated from the University of Chicago. He also holds an A.M. from Columbia, and for one year studied at Crozer. For eleven years he was a professor at the International Baptist Theological Seminary, at East Orange. Since 1936 he has been minister of the Bethlehem Slovak Congregational Church, Duquesne, Pa. We are happy to publish his timely appreciation of his great fellow countryman.

Space prevents but the briefest identification of our many able reviewers. Professor Abrams is a member of the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania. Dr. Aubrey is professor of Christian theology and ethics at Chicago. Dr. Austin, minister of the Tioga Baptist Church, of Philadelphia, holds a doctorate in philosophy from Pennsylvania. Professor Brightman, of Boston University, is a frequent contributor. Millar Burrows is professor of biblical theology at Yale. Dr. Cole, for many years a professor at Crozer, is director of the Service Bureau for Intercultural Education. Mr. Keighton is still at Narberth. Dr. Kluckhohn is a member of the department of anthropology at Harvard. Carl Kraeling holds the chair of New Testament at Yale. Dr. Parsons is professor *emeritus* of New Testament at Colgate-Rochester. Mr. Parvis is a graduate student in New Testament at the University of Chicago. Dr. Rose is minister of the First Baptist Church of Philadelphia. Dr. Scammell is a professor of English at Boston University. Dr. Wright is professor of philosophy at Dartmouth.

BOOK REVIEWS

Who Crucified Jesus? by Solomon Zeitlin, New York, Harper, 1942, pp. xv, 240, $2.50.

This is a work whose purpose is to show that responsibility for the death of Jesus of Nazareth rests not upon the shoulders of the Jewish people but upon Roman officialdom. An historical student of the New Testament will agree with this claim and will have immediate sympathy with such an attempt by a representative of a people who have all too often, and for too long a time, borne a stigma undesirable indeed.

To achieve his aim the author reviews at some length the political, social, and religious history of the Jewish people. Much of this is familiar ground and only the fact that the book is intended for the "laity" could justify the traversing once again of a field which is not very immediately connected with the specific problem of the book. Chapters follow on "The Gospels as Sources," "The Sermon on the Mount," "Jesus' Controversies with the Pharisees," "The Trial and the Crucifixion," "Peter and Stephen before the Sanhedrin," "The Trials of Paul," "History—Magistra Vitæ." It will be seen at once that the writer covers a much wider area than that of his specific problem.

In his discussions three matters of importance find special emphasis. First, the Sadducees, the officeholders under the Romans, were so hellenized that it is unfair to think of them as genuine Jews or to blame the Jewish people for what they did. Second, there were two types of Sanhedrin: the Sanhedrin proper, a distinctly religious body, dealing with religious questions of Judaism, sitting constantly, and strongly under Pharisaic influence and control; and political Sanhedrins, called generally by the Sadducees to deal with specific matters of a legal and political nature. For the acts of such assemblies neither the Pharisees nor the Jewish people are to be held responsible. Third, the Pharisees are not the externalists and "hypocrites" which the gospels represent them to be but are magnificent examples of "quietism" and spirituality in religion and as such could have had no quarrel with Jesus.

On this triple basis the author moves to his thesis, which is that "the Jewish people did not crucify Jesus" and that "the Jewish religious Sanhedrin and the Jewish people had nothing to do with the trial of Jesus." It is admitted that the high priest delivered Jesus to Pilate for trial, but the "Jewish people" did not will it. Political conditions forced the hand of the high priest.

With the conclusion that the crucifixion of Jesus was an act of the Roman authorities and that the Jewish people as such cannot be charged with its responsibility the reviewer is in complete agreement, as is practically every historical student of early Christianity. Some may question, however, whether the political and religious leaders of the people can be quite so thoroughly cleared of opposition to Jesus and of some connection with certain phases of his trial before Pilate as our author contends. Both in the general background of the argument and in the argument itself there is a tantalizing mixture of historical knowledge and insight and of special pleading. The argument regarding the two Sanhedrins needs a better foundation than the simple unquestioning reliance upon Tannaitic and Mishnaic evidence affords. The Sadducees, hellenized officeholders as they were, can scarcely be so thoroughly divorced from Judaism as the author thinks. The Pharisees, while certainly not deserving the critical condemnation which certain traditions in the New Testament give them, were not the immaculate religionists the writer pictures. He has fallen into the same error which characterized the controversy of Professors Abrahams and

Montefiore with Emil Schürer a half-century ago, namely, the taking of the finest flower of Pharisaism and treating it as characteristic of the whole. It is to be regretted that a conclusion so thoroughly warranted is not based upon a more judicial foundation. The attempt to separate the "real" Pharisees from the eschatological hopes of the Jewish nation is historically questionable.

The author admits that only "occasionally" are Jews called "Christ killers." Thus it can scarcely be considered an important cause of hostility toward the Jews. With anything that will remove the shameful and unreasoning bases of anti-Semitism every historically minded person will sympathize. But one wonders just how effective a service a volume of this kind will render when so constantly the historical thesis of the book becomes secondary to an apologetic for the superiority of Judaism. When the admitted "Roman apologetic" of the New Testament is so justly criticized by the writer, it is disappointing to find him falling into a similar error on the other side. It is possible that if the attack on the anti-Jewish polemic in the New Testament is to be made in the interests of creating a better feeling toward present-day Jews it would be wiser to let Christian writers continue to do the work to which not a few have set their hand.

It is surprising to find no reference to Hans Lietzmann's *Der Prozess Jesu,* Conrad H. Moehlman's *The Christian-Jewish Tragedy,* or R. H. Lightfoot's *History and Interpretation in the Gospels,* any one or all of which would have furnished the author with excellent material for parts of his argument. Perhaps some of their conclusions might have compelled some adjustment by the writer. The selected bibilography at the close of the book, while including some excellent works, could be much improved.

The reviewer recognizes the learning and earnestness of the author and is in such agreement with the main contention that he wishes that it had been more objectively presented.

ERNEST W. PARSONS

The Social Background of the Old Testament, by David Jacobson, Cincinnati, Hebrew Union College Press, 1942, pp. xi, 327, $2.00.

This book is a revised and expanded Ph.D. dissertation presenting the results of study at Cambridge University. It is published as Vol. II of the *Hebrew Union College Alumni Publication Series.* The material covered is broader than the title indicates, including several subjects which would ordinarily be classified under religious rather than social institutions, though of course (like everything human) they have a social significance. The scope of the study is sufficiently shown by the chapter headings: Mother-right and Father-right; Marriage; the Family; the Individual and the Group; the Dead; Deity, Totem, and the Divine King; Blood and Sacrifice; Blood Revenge; the Levirate and Circumcision.

The book is a valuable collection of data regarding the background and origins of Hebrew society and religion. A vast amount of material is assembled in the text, and more (with a wealth of bibliographical references) in the notes, which are inconveniently placed at the end of each chapter. The author has read very widely. Unfortunately, to judge from the fact that he twice attributes to the reviewer views quite different from those expressed in the publications referred to, he has not always read as carefully as might be desired. It must be said in all fairness, however, that he does not seem to have erred in this way to such an extent as to vitiate the essential accuracy of his reporting on most points.

More serious is the lack of a critical treatment of the problems raised. Sometimes what is given is hardly more than a list of facts and various views concern-

ing them. Usually where different views are presented the writer makes his choice and expresses a definite judgment, but with little indication of the grounds on which it is based. He is not always aware of the problems involved; in fact he is not at his best in analytical reasoning. Occasionally, though not often, he indulges in rather loose speculation, especially toward the end of the book; yet he does not confuse theories with facts nor possibilities with certainties. Space does not permit a discussion of his positions on specific questions, but most of them seem sound and reasonable. Theories of primitive promiscuity, Semitic matriarchy, and totemism in the Old Testament, for example, are rejected, and arguments from exceptional instances to accepted customs are treated with the suspicion they deserve. At the same time the value of the book lies more in exposition than in discussion. After all, what one expects of a dissertation is scholarly promise rather than maturity.

One weakness all too often characteristic of comparative studies is felt by the reader of this book. Facts drawn from Arab life on the one hand and from the ancient cultures of western Asia on the other are combined with the Old Testament data in such a way that it is sometimes difficult to tell which of them are being presented. The author himself, doubtless, does not assume that what is true of one people must be true of others, but an unwary reader might easily be led to such an inference.

In spite of these limitations, the book deserves a wide reading and careful study. It brings together in convenient form many significant facts with which students of the old Testament should be acquainted. The reviewer expects to consult it often and to bring it to the attention of his students.

MILLAR BURROWS

Our Eternal Contemporary, by Walter M. Horton, New York, Harper, 1942, pp. xx, 180, $2.00.

Mr. Horton has broached a problem that has recently been neglected in American theology; and has written a characteristically readable book on Christology. Organized along the lines suggested by Karl Heim's two books on Jesus, this volume deals with Christ as leader, as saviour, and as victor; and seeks to elucidate the church's faith that he is God and is eternally present.

The book is intended "for Christians, by a Christian," says the author (p. 153); and this perhaps accounts for the fact that it contains so little apologetical material. It is expository rather than argumentative; and the critical reader will find it disappointing because his questions, while recognized, do not receive painstaking consideration. Since the writer classifies himself as "a liberal Catholic in the Evangelical Protestant camp," it may be that he has abandoned apologetics. The result is not much happier than his self-classification, so far as enlightening the reader is concerned.

While insisting on the value of historical criticism, he holds that Jesus cannot be understood apart from mystical experience of him; but what the relation is to be between the epistemological assumptions of historiography and of mystical experience, he does not make clear.

"So long as there is vital *continuity* between the animating mind and spirit of the Christian movement and its historic Founder, we find Christ in the Church, and not only in Jesus" (pp. 19 f.—italics his). Does this mean that S. J. Case's theory of a developmental Christianity is embraced, or is there some honorific meaning attached to "vital," and if so, when is continuity vital? Until we know this, Jesus will not seem so necessary to the ongoing Christian movement.

The leadership of Jesus was that either of a madman or of a messiah. This choice is still before us. But what are the criteria for decision? Mr. Horton says that "if

he is sane, the modern world is crazy; and if the modern world is sane, he is stark mad" (p. 45). This is a striking utterance; but does it really help us? Is "the modern world" all of a piece? Are there not in it any values at all? He inveighs against those who test Jesus by the modern world. Does this mean we are to have no criteria drawn from modern experience for answering the ancient question, "What think ye of Christ?" He replies: "Our only instrument of precision is a mind and will sensitively alert to the guidance of the Mind of Christ . . . in this and every age" (p. 49). But surely this begs the whole question.

Jesus is our saviour "from eternal evils," and not merely an enlightener, says Dr. Horton; for in the crucifixion he actually reconciled man and God (pp. 62, 69), by establishing "a historic nucleus of right relationship between God and man" (p. 77), which is a relationship of faith. Does this mean an objective atonement on the metaphysical level? Apparently so, for he says, "The whole climate of earth, the whole relationship between earth and heaven, is different since he came" (p. 87). But just what was the change that took place objectively? This we are not told, so far as I can discover.

Jesus is victor over the forces of darkness, which today, as of old, threaten the world. This victory is "an achieved victory foreshadowing a future victory" (pp. 113 f.). But how? Alas, the answer is lost at the end in a discussion of pacifism.

The author believes in the Incarnation in which "God Himself became fully human" (p. 133). Does Horton accept the theory of divine kenosis, God "emptying himself"? This is suggested on p. 217, but not explicitly dealt with. What, in the light of this doctrine of the Incarnation, does Horton do with the problem of the relation of the human and the divine in the personality of Jesus Christ, the old problem of "the two natures"? He mentions it in an appendix, only to "refer theologically trained leaders to Mr. Pittenger's book" (*i.e.,* Norman Pittenger's *Christ and Christian Faith*). But surely, one has a right to expect the writer of a serious book on Christology to deal directly and fully with this problem.

Accepting the doctrine of a Second Coming with modifications, the author declares that "both Christ and Antichrist have reappeared in the world today. . . . The ear of faith can hear the sound of their spiritual combat filling the sky" (p. 149). This is perilous talk, as Horton well recognizes; and I wonder whether the dramatic appeal of such an eschatology does not blind him to the flood of vague and confused millenarianism which such a view can release.

As an indication of the direction in which the author's mind is moving, this book is disturbing. It looks as though he is in danger of sacrificing his critical activity as a theologian to homiletics and traditionalism. EDWIN E. AUBREY

Rethinking Our Christianity, by J. Neal Hughley, Philadelphia, Dorrance, 1942, pp. 242, $2.00.

This book is written by a professor of sociology at North Carolina College for Negroes. It is a worthy addition to the increasing list of works by Negro authors for whom one does not need to make any allowances. It stands on its own feet as a contribution to scholarship. Would that we had more professors of sociology as keenly aware of the religious crisis as is Dr. Hughley!

The book is a plea for a philosophy of Christianity and is based on the thesis that our religion is now facing the most challenging crisis which has ever confronted the Christian movement. If Christianity is to survive, our author argues, it must be as a social force, not as a museum of antiquities. It must denounce not merely "Communism, Humanism and 'un-Americanism,'" but also "the essentially pagan, un-

christian foundation of American capitalism." Also, Christianity must see itself as a growth, subject to "continuous and radical modification." Dr. Hughley agrees with Shailer Mathews and S. J. Case at this point. Hence it is futile to think of going back to first-century Christianity. It cannot and should not be "recovered." "What amounts to a new religion will emerge." In this view, Dr. Hughley agrees with men like Hocking and Pratt, although he does not cite their authority for it.

Having stated his problem, the author then subjects conservative and liberal Christianity to a searching examination, which manifests rare objectivity, sympathy, and insight. Both sides will protest as the shoe pinches, but neither side can complain of misrepresentation. Every preacher should read these able chapters, to help see himself in perspective—and possibly to help him grow in grace. Hughley is very sound in pointing out the dualism on which conservative theology rests, and in protesting against the depersonalizing of God in much liberalism.

A few points may be mentioned about which questions might be raised. "Perhaps," says Hughley, "the clearest and most consistent expression of the underlying metaphysics of contemporary science is found in the philosophy of John Dewey." This reviewer rises in protest. Dewey is important, yes; revolutionary in his influence, yes; but either clear or consistent, no, a thousand times, no.

The closing chapter of the book, dealing with the war, contains a rather sharp denunciation of pacifists that is harshly out of tune with the usual sympathy and fairness of the author. Perhaps Reinhold Niebuhr has influenced him too much; or perhaps he has purposely revolted at this point against the tolerance of liberalism.

Although the book is on the whole a diagnosis rather than a prescription, and although the author often protests against "abstract doctrines and essences," whether liberal or conservative, one of the most interesting parts of the book is the brief section where Dr. Hughley, after asking for "an anchor in dogma," offers his own doctrine of the essence of Christianity, "five central dogmas of the Christian religion which no conceivable social system can permanently uproot." These are strong words, unfortunately left without sufficient support. The five dogmas are: 1. the reality of God (a cosmic unifying Presence or Person), 2. belief in eternal meaning, 3. devotion to Christ, 4. application of the ideal of love as the absolute ethic, and 5. quest for the kingdom of God as the absolute order.

The uncertainty in which the reader is left about the fundamental importance of doctrine, which seems to be both affirmed and denied, taken with the judgment on Dewey quoted above, indicates that the author would profit by enrichment of his philosophical background. It seems invidious to make this suggestion, when one recalls that he is a sociologist who has already done a truly extraordinary amount of reading in theology. Yet in the area where theology and philosophy come together, the most vital field for his problem, he has not shown signs (so far as this reviewer has noted) of knowledge of the two most able philosophical theologians, F. R. Tennant, of Cambridge, and A. C. Knudson, of Boston. He does not cite Rall or Buckham or Flewelling or Nels Ferré. Among the older writers, he mentions Royce casually, but not Bowne, whose influence on religious thought was much greater than Royce's. Even William James, religiously far more significant than Dewey, is slighted. Philosophers like J. B. Pratt, J. S. Moore, W. M. Urban, and many others are ignored. Yet in saying this, the reviewer is aware of a certain unfairness to a book which does not aspire to be encyclopædic.

More serious is the seeming failure to recognize the function of reason in judging faith. The dogma of the personality of God, Hughley says, cannot be proved or disproved on the basis of strictly rational or scientific considerations. It is a "venture

of faith" (p. 211). But he fails to ask how the mind chooses from among possible faiths, if not on rational grounds. He is right in the insight that perfect demonstration is impossible; he is wrong in forgetting that only a rational faith is warranted.

Inability to see this point is doubtless at the root of his friendly surprise that "Brightman and the Personalists are among the few who emerge with a definitely and unequivocally personal God." The root of the trouble emerges when he endorses Professor Edwin Lewis's "profoundly meaningful statement" that "a speculative theism which is completely congruous with Christianity is not a speculative theism at all, but is a speculative defense for the Christian God in whom the thinker has already come to believe for other than speculative reasons." Neither Professor Lewis nor Professor Hughley seems to realize how skeptical this position is. It amounts to the assertion that theistic reasoning is a mere rationalization of Christian desires and that there is no reason to believe that Christian desires are well-grounded. The only face-saving device for Lewis would be to suppose that speculative theism means a theism that has nothing to do with experience; then the remark would be a belaboring of a man of straw.

In these times, typographical errors are delicate questions. "Say not the times are evil—who's to blame?" Dr. Hughley has fared reasonably well at the hands of the printer's devil. However, "Euthedemus" and "Zenophon" on one page (p. 30) are hard luck. The reading on p. 142 is in another class. Professor Horton is made to say the liberals "committed themselves to the outcome of free iniquity, whatever it may be." There the printer surely rubbed it into the liberals a bit too much. "Free inquiry" must have been the original text.

The breath of life blows through this strong and challenging book. The work of its young author promises further light and leading.

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN

Marcion and the New Testament, by John Knox, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1942, pp. ix, 195, $2.00.

With this work Professor Knox has added another significant title to the growing list of his publications. Like those that have gone before, the book makes excellent reading, the argument being developed simply and lucidly in spite of the technical nature of some of the material involved in its presentation. Only the first chapter concerns itself directly with Marcion the man, suggesting that with the to me dubious help of Polycarp's *Epistle to the Philippians* (chap. 7) it is possible to envisage a pre-dualistic Paulinist Marcion acting as a church worker in the Ægean area as early as 120 A.D. The larger part of the work deals with the significance of the schismatic leader for the creation by the "orthodox" church of an independent scriptural canon. It was the establishment of Marcion's canon, so Knox contends, that forced the church to create its own New Testament. Three arguments are given in direct support of this thesis: first, that in the pre-Marcionite period no scriptural authority attached to Christian documents in Christian usage; second, that the Christian canon corresponds to that of Marcion, both consisting of Gospel and Apostle; and third, that like Marcion's the Christian canon was apparently produced at Rome. The general character of the New Testament is taken as evidence of the technique used by the "orthodox" in defending themselves against the schismatics, their strategy being to conquer by absorbing. Hence in the orthodox canon we have one fourfold Gospel and an Apostle in which Paul's letters are combined with those of other apostolic authorities.

Three subsidiary arguments bolster the development of the main thesis: first,

that Marcion's Apostle shows the Pauline corpus at an earlier stage of development than that of the church in spite of excisions; second, that Marcion's Gospel was not a mutilated Luke but an otherwise unknown work combining Markan and Lukan elements; and third, that our Luke-Acts in its final form was composed under pressure of the Marcionite crisis in the period between 150 and 175 A.D.

The basic thesis of the book is in my judgment to be regarded as making a definite contribution to our thought about the development of the canon. The only question is whether it can be regarded as sufficient in itself to account for the whole development. If we were in a position to ask the so-called orthodox worthies of the late second century why a canon had developed in their midst, I think they would pooh-pooh the suggestion that some deep anti-Marcionite strategy was involved, and would point to the growing use of New Testament writings in the church during the course of the century quite as modern students of the canon have done. That would scarcely be of final significance for us, for they might not have been fully conscious of what was really going on. Yet it might indicate to us that we would do well to avail ourselves of the distinction frequently made in other fields between the effective and the compulsive factors in a given development, and to allow for both. Marcion may well, as Knox suggests, have been the outward compelling circumstance of the canon's development, while the growing significance of the individual compositions and their use could well be regarded as having had some effective part to play in the procedure. Without this second factor it would be hard to understand what impelled Marcion himself to create a canon consisting of Gospel and Apostle.

Of the three subsidiary arguments that concerning the Marcionite form of the *corpus Paulinum* is familiar from Knox's *Philemon* and requires no further comment. The argument for the late second-century date of the final form of Luke-Acts will probably provoke no little discussion. Like all other arguments that posit several stages in the development of a document without the support of a careful literary analysis of the document itself, it hangs in the air and is hard to answer but still harder to maintain. The burden of proof lies with the proponent. That the hypothesis is not impossible a priori and worthy of the effort to verify it by means of literary analysis goes without saying. All one can do at the moment is to set forth what one regards as the augury of the undertaking. Since the nonuse of Luke-Acts in the early first century and the supposed application of certain of its characteristics to the Marcionite crisis can be explained equally well on other grounds than those suggested by Knox, no cogent prognosis can be developed by either side on this score. One is thrown back, therefore, on one's general conception of the character of the growing tradition about Jesus and the apostles, and on the particular place of Luke-Acts in that growth. Personally I am inclined to believe that a work written as late as 150-175 A.D. would use and view the tradition in a much more advanced form and from a more advanced angle than that of our Luke-Acts. So far as Acts is concerned, what is needed at this point in connection with the proposals both of Knox and of Riddle is a job of work that will trace the development of the tradition about Paul through the Pastorals, the D-text of Acts, the *Acts of Paul,* and the *Acts of Barnabas* in such a way as to permit us to fix the place of our New Testament Acts in the history of the growing tradition. Then we may be able to tell precisely where we stand both with regard to our knowledge of Paul's missionary career and with regard to the date of the Pauline part of Acts.

Perhaps Knox might have escaped from the necessity of making Luke-Acts so late if he had considered another possibility in his argument about Marcion's Gospel. The statistics which he presents show how difficult it is to assume that Marcion's

Gospel is a mutilated Luke. But is it necessary to postulate an unknown, pre-Lukan, non-Marcionite gospel to account for Marcion's? What is there to prevent the assumption that Marcion is himself the last representative of the Matthew-Luke school of compilers, and that he created his Gospel from Mark and Luke to serve his own purposes? Indistinguishable from Luke in its use of Markan material it might well have come to be regarded as a version of Luke by reason of its use of Lukan *propria*. Here again everything depends upon one's general view of the developments; and in his general view, it seems to me, Knox has not made enough of the phenomenon of Tatian. May it not be that gospel composition in the period after Mark and the Second Source involved the appearance of two types of documents: one the eclectic combinations such as we have in Matthew, Luke, and Marcion's Gospel, the other the harmonizing combination such as the *Diatessaron*? The church, one could argue, put an end to both types of development by creating the canon on the one fourfold Gospel, the Gospel of the "Separated Ones." Further study of the general problem might be rewarding. That it raises basic issues requiring further study is by no means the least of the contributions of Knox's work.

CARL H. KRAELING

The Five Books of Moses, by Oswald T. Allis, Philadelphia, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1943, pp. xii, 319, $3.00.

This is a book written to defend the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. It is written because the author feels that the consequences of the rejection of the claim that the Pentateuch is Mosaic are serious indeed. In fact he is convinced that "if we believe Moses, we will believe Christ, and, if we do not believe Moses, we will not believe Christ" (p. 246). He is not willing to stop short of a full acceptance of the supernatural in the Bible; the theology of crisis with its compromise of the "superhistorical," and the position of W. F. Albright, who would take the miracles of the New Testament out of the domain of the historian, are futile attempts to combine naturalism and supernaturalism, "oil and water" which will not mix. So the author is frank in stating his purpose as a defense of the supernaturalism of the Pentateuch, and he is honest in asserting the reason for this attempt to go against the stream of biblical cricticism of the last century, the general interpretation of archæological results, and the results of comparative religion of the ancient Near East. He says: "If Prophetic Religion repudiated sacrifice and stood in sharp contrast to Priestly Religion . . . then sacrifice is unnecessary and the Cross loses its meaning . . ." (pp. 175 f.). When so much hangs on the demonstration that the Old Testament record is an accurate and trustworthy witness to events as they actually happened, it is no wonder that the author has attempted to discredit the "Graf-Wellhausen-Driver-Pfeiffer" (wrapper) theory of the Pentateuch. His own method of interpreting the Pentateuch is the "harmonistic" method, which proceeds upon the "natural and proper assumption that the Pentateuch was intended to give a true and self-consistent account of the matters of which it treats and that the student of Scripture should therefore interpret Scripture in the light of Scripture" (p. 122). Doublets in the Pentateuch are to be explained either by the delight of Hebrew writers for compound sentences or by a desire on the part of the author to secure emphasis by repetition. The parallel accounts of Abram's deceit regarding his relationship to his wife and the remarkably similar account of Isaac doing the identical thing are unexplainable phenomena which abound in history and which give rise to the proverb, "History repeats itself" (pp. 82 f.). Dr. Allis, who has himself no theory to present to make the Pentateuch a little more acceptable to human reason and experience, is in a position to ridicule the attempts of the critics and historians

without being vulnerable on details. His whole case rests in the acceptance or rejection of the dogma that Moses wrote what the voice of Jehovah spoke. The book will not convince many who do not already accept that dogma, but may serve to deepen the conviction of those who are already confirmed in this faith. The author has read widely and has written an interesting book. On the whole it is scholarly in tone and presents fairly the position of those with whom the author disagrees violently. He has attempted a task which is usually associated with the efforts of men with much less talent and knowledge.

JAMES B. PRITCHARD

Preaching from the Prophets, by Kyle M. Yates, New York, Harper, 1942, pp. xv, 225, $2.00.

Each of eighteen Hebrew "prophets" (including Moses and Jonah who is dated at 800 B.C.) is discussed according to the pattern of the background, the man, the book, and practical lessons of permanent value. The background generally represents the orthodox view of conservative historians of the periods under discussion. The appraisal of the man is often composed of brief paragraphs quoted from a dozen or more writers on the prophets. The book of the prophet is generally accepted as a unity and as coming from the hand of the prophet himself. However, the reader is allowed to choose for himself whether there were two or even three Isaiahs. If he should choose the more radical view, he "may still value the material as highly as he could if he were convinced that Isaiah wrote it all" (p. 89).

This book has served to demonstrate to this reader the utter impossibility of understanding the message of the prophets without viewing the religion of the Old Testament as a development from the lower to the higher. When one starts with the assumption that his own religious ideas came full-grown in a "revealed religion" to the prophets, he is apt to portray Moses and Elijah, who stood in a day of primitive beginnings, as plaster saints and not as the real men they were. Both Moses (p. 14) and Elijah (p. 28) are said to have been men of prayer. Moses is described by material drawn from Ecclesiastes, Deuteronomy, and II Corinthians. The obvious message of the universalism of Yahweh found in Jonah is not mentioned, but Jonah is carefully fitted into the historical outline with the remark that "the great old preacher, Jonah, might still have been alive when Amos began his ministry" (p. 34).

Among the most useless features of this book is the list of permanent values which is placed at the close of each chapter. It consists of pious, trite remarks which might be as well applied to one prophet as another or to a biography of a mediæval saint. After discussing the life of Moses the author concludes that "unselfishness is one of the chief marks of a great man" (p. 16). The study of Samuel calls for the exclamation, "What a work one man can do when God controls and directs him" (p. 21). Elijah illustrates "the tremendous value of one man who is wholly committed to God" (p. 31). Hosea illustrates that "there is a real danger of becoming like those with whom we associate" (p. 82). The book is filled with such sweeping, pious generalities which in no way define the personality of the prophet nor inspire the preacher.

This habit has led the author into some strange contradictions. When Jeremiah is summarized in terms of permanent value, the reader is told: "Formal repetitions of pious phrases and the offerings of costly sacrifices are but an insult to God" (p. 148). Soon from Joel one learns: "The externals of religion are not to be lightly regarded" (p. 197) and "Carelessness and indifference in worship may be the first step in spiritual decline" (p. 219).

This is an unfortunate book—unfortunate because it may lead some preacher to give up entirely the hard task of preaching from the prophets.

JAMES B. PRITCHARD

A Realistic Philosophy of Religion, by A. Campbell Garnett, Chicago, Willett, Clarke, 1942, pp. xii, 331, $3.00.

This is a scholarly, stimulating, and constructive interpretation of religion from the realistic standpoint. "The main thesis of this book" is "that man's consciousness of God rests upon the element of conflict that exists within the moral life, a conflict that is first felt between the egotistic and altruistic tendencies of our nature" (pp. 51 f.). The first of the three parts into which the body of the volume is divided is an analysis of religious experience, the immediate datum of which is found to be the altruistic will with the call of duty and the voice of conscience, which cannot be explained away as subjective or the product of social pressure, but which disclose something supernatural within us that comes to be known as God. The strongest evidence for this thesis is found in experiences of conversion, but instances of "the religion of healthy mindedness" are claimed not to be in conflict with it. Opposing explanations of the origin of religion are criticized.

In the second part, the social consequences of this interpretation of religion are set forth as the author conceives them. He contends against Dewey, Marx, and the New Humanists that faith in God and immortality is usually and normally a stimulus and not an hindrance to moral and social progress. However, churches should be tolerant, and admit into their fellowship all persons of good will without absolutely requiring acceptance of orthodox doctrines of the transcendence of God and personal immortality. Such persons apparently would have to be willing to accept Christ as the supreme spiritual leader. Garnett hopes that a common world religion will ultimately prevail, in which former Mohammedans, Confucians, and Buddhists will accept Christ as "religious leader of the world," only in subordination to whom they will revere the founders of their own former religions. Insistence upon belief in Jesus as more important than faith in God may seem surprising. A possible explanation may be that Garnett is anxious to hold within the churches persons who admire Jesus but are uncertain about God and immortality. Possibly the more radical New Testament critics might find it difficult to ascribe to the historic Galilean Jesus all the perfections that Garnett evidently supposes him to have possessed. And, one might ask, if in the future world religion former Christians continue to accept the idealizations of Christ that have developed since his death, why might not former adherents of other religions retain the posthumous idealizations of the founders of those religions?

In the third part, Garnett advances grounds for belief in immortality and God. While science offers no conclusive evidence, it leaves room for immortality as at least possible. The best reason for belief in it is faith in the goodness and power of God. For the existence of God, Garnett relies principally on moral and value arguments. The experience in man of an altruistic will gives the feeling of something transcendent—a power derived from some agency beyond the self. This feeling is strengthened by religious experiences like conversion. Further confirmation is afforded by the sense of moral obligation, most reasonably understood as the voice of God within us. Moreover, the objectivity and absoluteness of values point to a transcendent God as their source. Man has direct experience of God in his consciousness of another and higher will within himself—a will that is personal. So God is personal, as well as immanent and transcendent. God's power is limited:

however, "the extent of divine power over the physical world and human behavior seems to be sufficient for our faith in immortality and the validity of our values" (p. 293).

With Garnett's interpretation of religion this reviewer is in general agreement. There are only a few criticisms he wishes to offer. Perhaps there is too much emphasis on duty and the conflict between egoism and altruism as the primary sources of our knowledge of God, since this seems to have implications that Garnett certainly would not accept. For if every virtuous impulse a man has be accredited to God, this would seem to make man of himself a creature of total depravity. And the oftener a man's impulses harmonize with one another, with those of other persons, and with the will of God, the more rarely does he feel a sense of duty, conscience, and moral obligation; does it follow that the better a man becomes, the more rarely is he aware of God? While the arguments for God based on moral and religious experience and the objectivity of values are ably presented, they might well have been supplemented by arguments of different character. The case for the existence of God rests on the convergence of evidence from many sources.

WILLIAM KELLEY WRIGHT

Philosophy for the Millions, by J. A. McWilliams, New York, Macmillan, 1942, pp. vii, 206, $2.00.

In this volume, Father J. A. McWilliams, head of the department of philosophy at St. Louis University, endeavors to avoid technical terms that he may make philosophy interesting to the great mass of men. His contention is that philosophy should not be the privilege of the few, but the possession of the many.

The philosophical thesis of the book is that there should be one philosophy for all men. Obviously, the opposite is true. Different men cleave to diverse philosophies. Yet this is not as it should be. Just as there cannot be two true maps of the United States, so there cannot be more than one true philosophy. Elaborating this thesis, Father McWilliams states what the one true philosophy is.

> The philosophy to which I invite your attention holds that man is something more than a machine, an automaton, a robot, a Frankenstein. He is not simply wound up and driven by some secret mechanism; he is the driver, he has some control over the mechanism, and he does not totally cease to be when the mechanism finally stalls. This philosophy is observant enough to know that social peace and prosperity cannot be maintained in this world without the deep conviction that each individual man has a life that does not end with the grave. This philosophy holds that the moral law is not a tyrannical ukase imposed on man, but that instead it aims at the good of the individual and the race. Man, it is true, is able to act against that law, but so to do is to act against his own good and the good of mankind, and he must remember that the rewards and punishments rest with a power superior to man. For that reason this philosophy is one of hope and happiness, not a philosophy of selfishness, desperation and despair. In this philosophy man can appreciate his own dignity and that of his fellow men, he does not have to regard himself as just a better breed of monkeys; he knows justice, he knows charity, he knows that his life is a thing imperishable (pp. 17 f.).

This one true philosophy has personal implications for man's life. By means of it he knows that the most human thing about him is his power to choose. Being free, he knows that he is the originator of his lines of action. Controlling these, he alone determines how much energy he will put into each enterprise. As he exercises freedom, he learns that he can freely give, freely receive, and be freely grateful. The joy of being human is discovered within these three capacities.

This one true philosophy also has social implications. Since man is meant to be free, and since there is an inherent dignity to his life, the state can never have the right to use him simply as a means to an end. On the contrary, *"there is no legitimate civil authority except such as exists for the protection and exercise of natural*

rights" (p. 68). Whenever government destroys such rights, among which are family and parental rights, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, then the state becomes evil and men have the right to oppose it. Among the many other social implications of this one true philosophy is the right to property, which "is a natural right that is inalienable." Without some rights to private property man could be deprived of the right to live, since his clothing and food could be taken away from him without any wrong being done. This contention is obviously aimed at communism, which holds to the right of communal property only, and at state absolutism, which holds to the right of private property only by state permission.

Once more, the one true philosophy has spiritual implications. Since man possesses free will and intelligence, his life is not entirely material and organic as behavioristic psychology would have us believe. Possessing this life superior to that of the body, and possessing as well the desire to be free from the limitations which hamper him here on earth, man has therein the Creator's promise of immortal life if he but deserves it. Yet another spiritual implication of this true philosophy is found in the life of religion, which Father McWilliams finds to be "natural to man." "By religion," he writes, "I mean internal and external acts which are, and are intended to be, a reverent acknowledgment of the Supreme Being to whom ultimately we owe our life and on whom we depend for the final fulfillment of that life" (p. 124). Such religion will find its expression in a devotion to religious truth rationally discovered, in the acceptance of revelation, and in devotion to the church which God established, along with the acceptance of its unique form of sacrifice plus the body of doctrine which God has provided for it.

There is much in this volume to commend it to the average reader. It presents clearly the major outlines of a Christian philosophy of life: the dignity, sanctity, and freedom of the person; the sacredness of family life; the subordination of the state; the obligation of service; the supremacy of love; the importance of the church. On the other hand, the lay reader should be aware that what lurks here, among much that is excellent, is definitely a Roman Catholic philosophy of life. The approach to God is definitely and typically Aquinian. Man can know by reason that God is, but many of the truths about God and his workings are above reason and must be accepted as revelation. Likewise, because of such revelation, one is to accept without question the church, its central act of sacrifice in the Mass, and its body of doctrine. Here Father McWilliams proves himself a true son of Mother Church. The archbishop might well write at the beginning of the book *"nihil obstat."* Despite this inevitable Roman Catholic bias, the book deserves the attention of all thoughtful laymen.

GEORGE W. DAVIS

The Role of Conjuring in Saulteaux Society, by A. Irving Hallowell, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1942, pp. xiv, 96, $1.25.

The studies of Professor Hallowell on a group of Indians living in the Lake Winnipeg region in Canada have a high repute among all anthropologists who value honest field work, scrupulous documentation, and lucidity of presentation. Among close students of his work Hallowell's position as a theorist is steadily mounting. He has never put forward an imposing (or bewildering) new terminology; he has never pretentiously founded a new "school" and defended its claims with messianic fervor. This latter is one way rapidly to attain a wide (though possibly ephemeral) reputation in the emergent science of social anthropology, but such a course would have been completely incompatible with Hallowell's characteristic modesty and painstaking eclecticism. As a theorist, Hallowell is an integrator and a most useful one. If the

nonanthropologist wishes to find the sanest—and yet illumined with all the insights of contemporary psychology—the most balanced—and yet coherent conceptual scheme which an anthropologist has been able to produce by the 1940's—he may well turn to any of Hallowell's recent papers or monographs.

The study under review is an excellent illustration. The reader finds a conceptual scheme which is mature and sophisticated. Moreover, he finds it convincingly applied to a substantial range of concrete data. These data are themselves intrinsically interesting, even to those who have no concern for the ethnography of the North American Indians as such. The discussion of the "shaking tent" form of conjuring penetrates deeply into some of the most basic and some of the most general problems of "the psychology of religion." The reviewer knows of no consideration of religious skepticism (alike from the standpoint of practitioner and "parishioner") which is so pointed, so specific, so multidimensional. The question of "the making of a conjurer" and the matter of participation are treated tough-mindedly and on the basis of detailed case histories. Finally, conjuring is examined with respect to its interdigitation with other activities and with the rest of the cultural tradition: one understands the adjustive and adaptive functions which conjuring performs for the individual and for the society so that its survival, even among Christianized Indians, seems no longer a reason for wonder or even mild despair.

The descriptions of conjuring performances and of all the sheer behavior (including, of course, verbal behavior) associated with the tent-shaking rite are eminently satisfying. But Hallowell is abundantly aware that either concepts alone, or percepts alone are inadequate:

> . . . to understand a conjuring seance requires more than external observation of it. It necessitates a knowledge of the world view of the people among whom it occurs and the role conjuring plays in their lives.

The discussion of the central premise that "the world is always perceived and derives its meaning and significance from the beliefs and presuppositions of a particular culture" and the *obiter dicta* upon the peculiar blindness which our "scientific" stated and unstated postulates impose upon us should be required reading for all serious students of human beings, regardless of whether they consider themselves "anthropologists" or "psychologists" or "theologists." To the technician the application and exemplification of this conceptual jumping-off-place in the empirical portion of the monograph will seem an as yet unequaled model, meriting the deepest admiration and the closest study.

CLYDE KLUCKHOHN

Society Under Analysis, edited by Elmer Pendell, Lancaster (Pa.), Jacques Cattell Press, 1942, pp. viii, 711, $4.00.

"Society under analysis"—the phrase is revealing. Twenty-one diagnosticians have submitted the structure of human society to critical study with a view to interpreting the nature of human relationships and social change. Each man is a specialist in a particular field of inquiry; he has contributed his sectional discoveries to the situation as a whole. The result of the analysis, under careful editorial supervision involving logical and functional relation of materials, is a comprehensive introduction to the nature of society and how it perpetuates itself within the bounds of a strictly law-abiding natural order.

This latter observation suggests the uniqueness of the text. The authors have taken care to indicate how intimately man's lot is tied in with the forces of the physical, chemical, geological, and biological elements in environment (Part II). Interactions between man and nature are not accidental nor sporadic but intimate and

vital. They need to be taken account of, to be appraised in terms of causal control of man, and to be related to the psychical and social forces which, working together, make persons and societies the kinds of realities they actually are.

The book was written to serve as an introductory text in the field of sociology. It serves its purpose well. The instructor who uses the text as a backlog of scientific knowledge and as a pattern of procedure, providing he can make social subject matter pulsate with life, will afford students an informative and fascinating exposure to the social scene on this planet. Of course, the student will find it necessary to discipline his thought processes and semantic urges if he is to acquire "analytical" skill in the field of human relations. The ideology of social science is strange to the novitiate, the methods of inquiry highly technical, and dependable orientation a slowly achieved goal of endeavor. The first half of the book (Parts I, II, and III) will probably test the patience and ability of the student more than the second half. Much of the former represents the scaffolding of widely diversified fields of learning; the latter deals with the structure of social institutions and with conditions of social change, with which youth are more familiar.

As in the case of any book of composite authorship, this volume reflects uneven levels of mature scholarship and degrees of variance in matters of theoretical interpretation. The writers, without exception, have respected one basic principle of science: they have maintained the detached role of the scientist in attempting to set forth the facts and their relationships—*what is*—and in leaving the normative aspect of social study—*what ought to be*—to philosophers, religionists, or propagandists. The reviewer believes there is one unfortunate omission in the book. Since mankind is so acutely involved on a global scale in culture conflicts, a chapter might well have been included in Part V ("social tensions") dealing with the theme of war and peace techniques of social adjustment. The concept "race" is used erroneously on pp. 412 and 430 by two different authors. The theme of democracy as a social force is dealt with rather sparingly. Quite effectively, the opening and closing chapters deal with the evolution of culture, the former primarily with that of the prehuman primates and the latter with that of man.

STEWART G. COLE

Christian Symbolism in the Evangelical Churches, by Thomas Albert Stafford, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1942, pp. 176, $2.00.

Whatever may be the shortcomings of this little book, and they are few indeed, they will be completely overlooked in the light of its many excellent features. In Dr. Stafford's book, we have for the first time a work on symbolism which is written from the standpoint of evangelical Christianity.

For altogether too long those of us who are members of Protestant churches, and particularly of nonliturgical churches, have ignored the great symbols which are a part of our common religious heritage. In so doing, we have deprived our people of their just share in that heritage. More and more we are coming to realize the values which lie in visual education. Too often, however, we forget that the symbols of the Christian church should be included under this heading. These symbols on our church windows and furnishings "indicate pictographically the cardinal elements of Christian faith, tradition, and teaching by presenting to the eye an interesting and valuable supplement to preaching and religious education" (p. 18). Dr. Stafford points out that the use of forms and symbols in our churches will do much to awaken a deeper reverence for the sanctuary, and to give to men the quiet of mind and discipline of spirit which are so necessary in the world of today. He warns, however, against building altars and putting crosses upon them and then expecting them auto-

matically to cure the fundamental faults in our church life. "There are three virtues," he says, "worthy of special praise in the use of venerable church forms and symbols; namely, reverence, simplicity, and sincerity, not the least of which is sincerity" (p. 31).

After two brief chapters on symbolics and the reasons why the evangelical churches should make greater use of symbols, Dr. Stafford devotes nine chapters to an explanation of the major symbols which have been used during the long history of Christianity. Under the general headings: "Symbols of the Godhead," "Sacred Monograms," "Symbols of Christ's Suffering," "Symbols on the Great Chalice of Antioch," "Symbolic Stars," "Symbols of Doctrines and Ideas," "Symbols of New Testament Characters," "Symbolism of a Church," and "Symbolism of Color," he shows the origin and traces the use of a great number of symbols which we of the evangelical churches seldom see, or, if we do see, of the meaning of which we are entirely ignorant. These chapters are perfectly illustrated by fifteen plates which were drawn by Dr Stafford himself. A chapter on "Teaching Christian Symbolism" completes the book. An excellent bibliography, an invaluable glossary of church terms and usages, and a very complete index add greatly to the book's usefulness.

One cannot help but wish that Dr. Stafford had given less space to his chapter "The Symbolism of a Church" and much more to his chapter "Teaching Christian Symbolism." Much of the material in the former chapter seems hardly to be relevant to the general character of the book, and certainly Dr. Stafford has at hand much more material than he included in the latter chapter.

Dr. Stafford's *Christian Symbolism* will fill a longfelt need in its field. It will prove of inestimable value in the hands of the minister who is striving to build more deeply devotional services, and in the hands of the teacher, either minister or layman, who is striving to impart a deeper knowledge of church history and of Christian belief to his class. In the opinion of this reviewer, there is a real place for this book in the library of every evangelical church.

MERRILL M. PARVIS

Peace Now and Forever, by Max Molyneux, Superior (Wisc.), Silver-Tonsberg Press, 1942, pp. xii, 162, $1.50.

The author describes his work as "an attempt to draw inductively from the study of the sciences, the humanities, and practical life, a reasonable working philosophy of *Man in Action.*" He calls this a "New Science," to which he gives the name "*homo-dynamics.*"

Part I of the book is devoted to a discussion of the principles of this "New Science." Certain limitations of the mental and physical sciences are pointed out, and the notions that "scientists have a superior kind of logic," and that "through science men arrive at absolute truth," are declared to be fallacies. The scientific method is shown to require observation, generalization, and verification. No observation is regarded as all-inclusive; no generalization as having been proven beyond a doubt. Theories which appear to have been verified in practice for some time are seldom found to be entirely repudiated, but are usually supplemented by new discoveries and adapted to new conditions.

These considerations are basic with the writer in his discussion of the urges which drive men to action. The most dominant of these is said to be "the urge to survive," but even this powerful urge needs "the further stimulus of some generalization or assumption (such as honesty or justice), which, added to the urge, will give the dynamic."

When the author faces the question as to the source of information concerning dynamics, he declares, "The prime facts are in life itself, not in a logical system of

philosophy about life." With this in view he discusses various dynamics in chapters designated by such mathematical captions as "First Power," "Nth Power," "Infinite Power," etc. His vigorous conclusions concerning these powers appear in the following quotation: "The only thing the trouble with primitive man was his damned persistency. And one of the most striking examples of it is his assumption of a soul. . . . And from this unlimited assumption has come unlimited dynamics ever since. . . . He even had the audacity to assume that his own assumptions would last with him . . . he immortalized them . . . in prose and verse. Then in a final determined effort to keep on living he boxed all of his assumptions from four corners of the compass and called the whole parcel of them God. And the *Cause Uncaused*, the *Mover Unmoved,* the *Creator Uncreated,* became the source of unlimited dynamic for all the truly powerful movements since the beginning of recorded time."

Dr. Molyneux insists that "the results of a belief in God are as apparent as are the effects of the power of gravity or electricity," and asserts that Christ, the Christian church, and the Bible, are unequaled in power to produce these effects.

The second section of the book is concerned with applications of *homodynamics* especially in the direction of world peace. Here it is insisted that everything that makes up our western culture "is inseparably and inescapably enmeshed with the dynamics of Jesus," and that when anyone is convinced of that truth, the conflict within himself will be resolved and a contribution made toward the settlement of the "Global War." If the world is to escape destruction, human conduct must be based upon "the Mind and Teachings of Christ."

The struggle in which the nations of the earth are now engaged is the "conflict between authoritarianism and the sacred right of the individual to survive." The teachings of Christ have compelled mankind to face the issue of world peace. Only the mind of Christ, fully possessed, can bring its realization. Christ must be accepted as a leader in place of false and selfish guides. He will show the way from international chaos to universal peace.

The idea that this hoped-for consummation may be brought about by geometrical progression may seem naïve and impractical, but it is the way in which all significant movements in human history have gone forward. The progression may be interrupted here or there without its total movement being seriously affected. The author's proposal that this method be used to create a "Union of *All Christians the World Over*" with the object of bringing about "Peace Now and Forever" is one that seems to give promise of success.

A review such as this can give but a faint idea of the value of this brief but significant volume. "Of the making of many books there is no end," but this is one you cannot afford to miss.

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER

BOOK NOTICES

Greek Foundations of Traditional Logic, by Ernst Kapp, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. viii, 95, $1.50.

This book will be of interest to the student of philosophy and its specialized branch of logic. Definitely, it is not a book dealing with logic as such, but one which seeks to disclose the roots of logic in Plato and Aristotle. Treating the four main topics of traditional logic, which are concepts, judgments, syllogisms, and induction, Dr. Kapp traces the origins and meanings of these in Greek philosophical thought. He points out that with the Greeks logic found its subject matter almost entirely in the field of conversation. It included only what was "capable of external performance or external experimentation between two people." Concepts grow out of the perception of "what is this or that"—definitely a conversational issue. Judgments grow out of what two people in conversation are able to verify. A syllogism, for Aristotle, "is an argument in which, certain things having been assumed, something other than these follows of necessity by virtue of the things assumed." Induction is the means used in conversation to lead "a person on to universal truth by confronting him with single instances in which he is already able to see it." Because the ancients confined their interest in logic to conversation, rather than to the construction of a logical system covering the whole of life, they were able to avoid the difficulties which trouble modern logicians. The volume is not easy reading. It is not meant for the amateur, but for the mature student of philosophy. GEORGE W. DAVIS

In Commemoration of William James 1842-1942, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. xii, 234, $2.75.

This commemorative volume, published on the centenary of the birth of William James, consists of four parts. The first three comprise series of papers presented respectively at meetings and conferences of philosophers during 1941 and 1942. Part four consists of three papers from other occasions, all of which deal with the philosophical emphases of James' thought. The contributors to the volume are Henry James, Horace M. Kallen, Dickinson S. Miller, Edwin B. Holt, John Dewey, Julius S. Bixler, Ralph Barton Perry, George S. Brett, Donald Cary Williams, Herbert W. Schneider, Jacob R. Kantor, Victor Lowe, Charles Morris, Eugene W. Lyman, Arnold Metzger, and Walker H. Hill. The book contains a comprehensive appreciation of the comprehensive mind of William James. It discloses him coming out of biological and medical training in the 1860's to turn in the 1870's to teaching in the field of psychology, and later, to philosophy. Accordingly, we find the contributors to this volume writing papers on William James as psychologist, empiricist, moralist, a pluralistic metaphysician, a philosopher of faith, and the founder of pragmatism. These appreciations of a many-sided personality are far too detailed for review or even mention in this brief notice. Suffice it to say that the collection provides us with many penetrating insights into the multiple work of one of America's most outstanding psychologists and philosophers. The volume should become an invaluable guide and source book to those interested in the thought and life of William James. GEORGE W. DAVIS

The Origin of Dewey's Instrumentalism, by Morton G. White, New York, Columbia University Press, 1943, pp. xv, 161, $2.25.

Fifty years ago John Dewey was saying that ". . . men go on thinking only because of practical friction or strain somewhere, that thinking is essentially the

solution of tension." Few American philosophers since William James have demonstrated the truth of that assertion more conclusively than Dewey himself. For sixty years he has been working out his ideas amid the conflicts and controversies of a developing America, constantly reconstructing and restating his opinions about life and mind. Since Dewey and his philosophy of "instrumentalism" are in the way of becoming a symbol of the restless, experimental mind that is America, a survey of the sources from which Dewey develops his ideas constitutes also a survey of the forces which have produced our American culture. Such a survey, in the hands of a capable writer who knows his field and his man, makes fascinating reading. The survey begins with one of those ironical situations so familiar in the history of philosophy—Dewey at Johns Hopkins in the 1880's, a convinced Hegelian and anti-empiricist, apparently unaware of the presence on the campus of Charles Pierce, pioneer pragmatist, by whom Dewey might have been guided then to a method which he was to discover in Pierce only after twenty arduous years of inquiry on his own. Instead, it was his lot to struggle through the conflict between his allegiance to the older idealistic epistemology and the claims of the new experimental psychology. In the nineties he had gone on from this, through a study of Spinoza's organicism, to an examination of the whole field of formal logic, a task which did not reach its conclusion until his *Logic* appeared in 1938, wherein he elaborated his own belief that thought is a doubt-inquiry process. But most interesting of all—to this reader, at least—were the two chapters in which the author describes in some detail Dewey's transition from the ethical idealism of Green, Morris, and Hegel to a functional theory of morality built, not on metaphysical foundations but rather on the data provided by the social sciences. The survey stops in the early years of the present century, but not before the main lines of thought leading to Dewey's full-fledged instrumentalism have been made clear.

EUGENE M. AUSTIN

Where Are the People? by Sidney W. Powell, New York, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1942, pp. 224, $1.75.

This is another of those books dedicated to the increasing of the efficiency of the church's leadership which may be regarded as at once an aggravation and an inspiration. Many who read it will recognize its very definite superiority in spirit and content and will call themselves debtor to Dr. Powell, especially for his inescapable emphasis upon the importance of a personalized ministry and church. Furthermore, a very considerable number of his readers will turn to their specific opportunities for approach, contact, and the maintenance of good-will, with a new appreciation of proved methods and the contributive value of intelligent, persistent effort in capturing and holding the hearts and minds of men for the things of Christ and his kingdom. The aggravation which such books inspire is obvious. We think we may ask with propriety as to whether it is in keeping with the nature and dignity of such an all-important thing as the religion of Christ Jesus our Lord to have so much effort put forth to make it appealing and attractive, considering that it has in and of itself such incomparable and irresistible grace and persuasiveness. Protest against the resort to clever and worldly-wise techniques is thoroughly respectable and may properly be kept in mind by those who are method-conscious. And yet consecrated common sense is ever worthy of the most serious consideration. This, with proper restraint and no little charm, the author makes impressively important in this thoroughly readable volume. The present reviewer is more keen to thank Dr. Powell for the impetus toward appreciation of the joy of genuine personal interest in all things human, than in the many and convincing suggestions as to effective improvement of pastoral or evangelistic processes.

IVAN MURRAY ROSE

Myths and Tales of the Chiricahua Apache Indians, by Morris Edward Opler (with an Appendix of Apache and Navaho Comparative References, by David French), Philadelphia, American Folk-Lore Society, 1942, pp. xiv. 114, $2.50.

The Chiricahuas, a branch of the Apaches, in 1886 were deported by the United States government from Arizona to Florida, later to Alabama, thence to Oklahoma, and after twenty-seven years in semidetention camps the majority were settled in Mescalero, New Mexico. Their mythology, as presented here, gives a valuable insight into their cultural history. Their relation to other tribes and their contact with the Spaniards and with the Christian missionaries are evident. The primitive characteristics of the group are revealed in their readiness to appropriate foreign traditions and to make themselves the heroes of them, to predate *posteventum* material and thus to find predictions, and to make untroubled use of quite contradictory variants. The tribal life was primitive, and the tales are naïve. Not a few of them are ætiological. Birds and animals at one time were peoples. They talk, live, and act as humans. The coyote is much in evidence, and in general aids man in his trouble. The rabbit, the ant, and the bee play a minor role. Monsters and giants, ancestral spirits and the gods are always on the fringe of life. All possessions that belong to the dead must be destroyed; the name, especially, must not be mentioned. The gods live in the "holy mountain," and are active in human affairs. In the early days "divine paternity" was not unknown. Disaster and prosperity, in the last resort, are in the lap of the gods. If insulted, they send plagues; if obeyed, game and crops are abundant. They open the mountain to crush the enemy or to conceal the friend. The blind receive sight, and the lame walk under their power. That *four*, derived from the points of the compass, should be the sacred number is interesting; that no reference is made to puberty rites of the male is perplexing. Studies of this kind are important for every thoughtful student of religion.

I. G. MATTHEWS

State Housing Agencies, by Dorothy Schaffter, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. xiii, 808, $7.50.

The author, who is a professor at Vassar College, has undertaken and completed the huge task of presenting the whole story of all the state housing agencies in this country from the earliest appearance in Massachusetts in 1909 down to the year 1941. No one else has made such a serious study of this particular subject. "The result of this extensive and long continued study," writes Professor Schaffter, "is the unqualified belief that immediate steps should be taken to insure full state participation in the public housing program." In her analysis she presents a plan for a genuine housing agency, since no existing agency seems to her to meet the qualifications. On the side of the Federal Government the United States Housing Authority is criticized for disregarding for the most part the existing state housing agencies. The basis for this policy is fundamentally weak in that "it fails to recognize that a single administrative body in a very large and well organized federal system cannot hope to operate on a unitary principle." The gradual acceptance of the idea of public housing is growing. Just as it is no longer argued that a community has the "right to be unhealthy or uneducated," within a few years the "right to be ill housed may no longer be conceded." The author hopes that after ten years experience with public housing on a considerable scale we shall go over the whole program and make changes on a realistic basis. There is no doubt that this is much needed and will probably take place after the war.

RAY H. ABRAMS

The Forgotten Hume, by Ernest Campbell Mossner, New York, Columbia University Press, 1943, pp. xv, 251, $3.00.

Two aphorisms emerge as one from this pleasantly thoughtful volume—"By their fruits ye shall know that actions speak louder than words." Hume's genial unselfishness reveals a Christianity and humanism in these pages that may well urge readers of scholarly bent to return to his essays and search once more for the religious element that must, after all, be readable between the lines that so disturbed the ecclesiasts of his day. Our breadth of interpretation today is notably so liberal as to occasion doubt as to whether theology can accept any creed, even with semantic flexibilities and deviations duly recognized. But the truly good man (*kalokagathos*) is still noted as one who in former times would have been thought saintly had he been ceremonious in conformity. Conformity in these days makes itself felt in functionalism, action that bespeaks true motive; and herein Hume's friends and even his enemies proclaim in their respective functions his unerring goodness. To measure him against Johnson, Rousseau, Boswell, and MacPhreson leads one to marvel at the deal of pother that the sentimental eighteenth century devoted to the big bowwows of the day, while they so easily overlooked the greatness of a fine humility of bearing—Hume's insistence on his logic conjoined with so fine a freedom from pride or ostentation. A book that belongs to the fireside, where, of an evening, after striving with this age of savagery, one can regain poise and, indeed, faith.

JOHN C. SCAMMELL

Guide for the Study of American Social Problems, compiled for the American Social Problems Study Committee, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. vii, 181, $1.00.

The title of this paper-bound book accurately signifies its contents. It is prepared primarily for use by discussion groups in schools, colleges, clubs, churches, unions, and similar organizations and supplies bibliographies and references to materials, most of them inexpensive, which can be used in guiding intelligent, democratic discussion on such topics as the consumer, the worker, the farmer, women, the Negro, youth, education, housing, civil liberties, national unity, and the problem of security. The materials present varying points of view in matters of controversy. As Dr. Margaret Mead, who writes the introduction to the book, says: "This guide is to help you make democracy work." The book has a chapter on the formation of community councils and also a list of organizations and publishers (with their addresses) which are particularly concerned with American social problems.

GORDON POTEAT

Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, edited by Arthur Dunham, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. xi, 670, $5.00.

Fifty-one of the 122 papers which were presented to the meetings of the National Conference of Social Work held in May, 1942, at New Orleans are included in this volume. These are arranged under such section titles as War Challenges Social Work, Minorities and Civil Liberties, Migration and the Alien, The Impact of the War upon Social Work Organization, Men in the Service, etc. There is an excellent index.

GORDON POTEAT

A World of Energy, by James J. Reeve, Boston, Bruce Humphries, Inc., 1942, pp. 338, $3.00.

Though this book is not an autobiography, it represents the author's attempt to think his way out of a rigid biblical authoritarianism into a conception of Christianity

which takes account of modern science and philosophy. The subtitle is *Rethinking the Christian Religion.* Dr. Reeve describes his education as very conservative: in his first twenty years in the ministry he "preached . . . the most orthodox sermons and believed in a most orthodox theology." He goes on to say that "during the last twenty years he has been compelled to rethink much of his theology." His conclusions will be startling and shocking to some, but commonplace to others. Though he shows no striking originality of mind or expression, his writing may provoke thought in some readers. However, the cost of the book, which is not attractively printed, is far too high.

GORDON POTEAT

The Harvest of the Spirit, by Eugene M. Austin, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1943, pp. 169, $1.50.

Here is another volume of sermons. Perhaps that strictly accurate statement is misleading. Volumes of sermons must sell; else so many would not be printed. This one was going to the "Books Received" section, that those who desire to know about newly published sermons might find a convenient—and brief—indication. And this despite the fact that the author is a former student and good friend. I chanced to leaf a few of the pages, liked what my eye fell on, and went through the whole book. That is so unusual a fate for sermons that in all fairness it enters the realm of "Book Notices." What makes a sermon good? Frankly I don't know, and I never knew any one else who (in my judgment) did either. Is it a trace of freshness, a dash of common sense, a modicum of honesty? I hope so. Anyhow, those who like to invest their cash in collections of sermons may well consider this one by a prominent Philadelphia minister.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems, edited by Elliott Van Kirk Dobbie, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. clxxx, 220, $4.50.

This volume, numbered Vol. VI of the *Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records,* presents the texts of fifty-three Anglo-Saxon poems, not all of them short and not all of them minor. Besides the text of each poem there are an introduction, bibliography, and notes for each poem. In addition to a number of poems that have not previously appeared in any collection of Anglo-Saxon poetry, it contains one poem, "Seasons for Fasting," which has never been printed before in any form. The extensive collation of notes and bibliography bears impressive testimony to the judgment and skill of the editor and offers a wealth of material for the student.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

BOOKS RECEIVED

I Married a Minister, edited by Golda Elam Bader, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1942, pp. 192, $1.50.

A composite picture of that often discussed individual, the "minister's wife," drawn jointly by eighteen who ought to know whereof they speak.

* *A Prophet and a Pilgrim,* by Herbert W. Schneider and George Lawton, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. xliii, 589, $5.00.

The Imperial Christ, by Selsos E. Tull, Nashville, Broadman, 1942, pp. 196, $1.50.

Twelve sermons by the pastor of the First Baptist Church of West Helena, Arkansas.

Reality of the Spiritual World, by Thomas R. Kelly, Wallingford (Pa.), Pendle Hill Pamphlet 21, pp. 62, $0.25.

Personalities of the Passion, by Leslie D. Weatherhead, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1943, pp. 183, $1.50.

Another volume of near-biographies: twelve individuals ranging from Mary to Dismas (the repentant thief), "whose name," we are told, "has the confirmation of the researches carried out by the late Dr. Rendel Harris, who was one of the greatest New Testament scholars in the world."

Greek New Testament Word List, collected by Bruce M. Metzger, Princeton (N. J.), privately printed, 1942, pp. 4, $0.10.

250 common words to supplement Machan's *New Testament Greek for Beginners.*

The Sanctuary, prepared by Lucius H. Bugbee, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1942, pp. 47, $1.85 (per hundred).

Lenten devotions.

Understanding the Contemporary World Crisis, by Conrad H. Moehlman, Rochester (N. Y.), privately printed, pp. 109, $0.75.

These ten lectures were delivered at the Third Presbyterian Church of Rochester. The audience rightly urged the lecturer to publish them in booklet form. All who know Professor Moehlman's mercilessly keen mind and trenchant pen will turn to them with anticipation—and they will not be disappointed in this brilliant study of why the United States must fight.

Carry On, by John Lacy Whorton, Nashville, Broadman, 1942, pp. 143, $1.00.

Nine sermons by the long-time pastor of the First Baptist Church, Longview, Texas, together with the sermon preached at his funeral by Dr. W. M. Craig, of Dallas, and a foreword by Gloria Young.

Around the Cross, by R. C. Campbell, Nashville, Broadman, 1943, pp. 195, $1.25.

Eleven sermons by the pastor of the First Baptist Church of Columbia, S. C.

Pageants of the Kingdom, by Myrtle R. Creasman, Nashville, Broadman, 1943, pp. 117, $1.25.

Ten pageants with suggestions for presentation and occasional music. They may be advertised with perfect safety as entirely suitable for old ladies and young children.

* To be reviewed.

The Gospel of the Grace of God, by J. Clyde Turner, Nashville, Broadman, 1943, pp. 165, $1.00.

Thirteen sermons by the author of *A Truth in a Smile,* who is also minister of the First Baptist Church of Greensboro, N. C.

The Broad Horizon, by Patience Strong, New York, Dutton, 1943, pp. 64, $0.50 (paper).

Another fragrant nosegay of exquisite prose-verse.

* *The Legacy of Egypt,* edited by S. R. K. Glanville, New York, Oxford University Press, 1943, pp. xx, 424, $4.00.

**Marriage Laws in the Bible and Talmud,* by Louis M. Epstein, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1942, pp. x, 362, $3.50.

**Myth and Society in Attic Drama,* by Alan M. G. Little, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. vii, 95, $1.50.

**The Great Century in the Americas, Australasia and Africa,* New York, Harper, 1943, pp. ix, 526, $4.00.

**A New Philosophy and the Philosophical Sciences,* by Apostolos Makrakis, New York, Putnam, 1940, 2 vols., pp. xxxiv, 843, and xxviii, 716, $7.50.

**The Negro in Colonial New England, 1620–1776,* by Lorenzo Johnston Greene, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. 404, $4.50.

**Religion and Health,* by Seward Hiltner, New York, Macmillan, 1943, pp. xiii, 292, $2.50.

**Living Upstairs,* by Francis Meehan, New York, Dutton, 1943, pp. 256, $2.50.

**The Church in Disrepute,* by Bernard Iddings Bell, New York, Harper, 1943, pp. 152, $1.50.

**The Nature and Destiny of Man: Human Destiny,* by Reinhold Niebuhr, New York, Scribner, 1943, pp. xii, 329, $2.75.

**The Quest for Preaching Power,* by John Nicholls Booth, New York, Macmillan, 1943, pp. xviii, 240, $2.00.

**What Is the Church Doing?* by Henry P. Van Dusen, New York, Scribner, 1943, pp. xii, 194, $1.00.

Alcohol the Destroyer, by C. Aubrey Hearn, Nashville, Broadman, 1943, pp. 149, $0.60.

**Intercultural Education in American Schools,* by William E. Vickery and Stewart G. Cole, New York, Harper, 1943, pp. xviii, 214, $1.00.

**The Jews in Spain,* by Abraham A. Neuman, Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society, 1942, 2 vols., pp. xxxi, 286, and xi, 399, $5.00.

**Religion Faces the World Crisis,* by Leroy Waterman, Ann Arbor, George Wahr, 1943, pp. viii, 206, $2.25.

**The Building of Eternal Rome,* by Edward Kennard Rand, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1943, pp. xi, 317, $3.50.

* To be reviewed.